



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e. $\frac{126}{5}$



THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
Quarterly Review.



Πύλαι ἄδου οὐ κατισχύουσιν αὐτῆς.—Matt. xvi. 18.

VOL. V.

London:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, 342, STRAND.

DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; PARKER, OXFORD; CURRY, AND MILLIKEN, DUBLIN; GRANT, AND LAING AND FORBES, EDINBURGH.

AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXXXIX.



CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
I. THE DOCTRINE OF THE DELUGE, vindicating the Scriptural Account from the Doubts which have recently been cast upon it by Geological Speculations. By the Rev. L. Vernon Harcourt.	1
II. A HISTORY OF POPERY; containing an Account of the Origin, Growth, and Progress of the Papal Power; its Political Influence in the European States-system, and its effects on the Progress of Civilization. To which are added, an Examination of the Present State of the Romish Church in Ireland; a Brief History of the Inquisition, and Specimens of Monkish Legends	33
III. CONVOCATION OF THE CLERGY—The Revival of Diocesan Synods: a Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Rochester, April, 1838	61
IV. PULPIT ELOQUENCE—The Works of Bishop Hall	75
V. LIVES OF SACRED POETS	102
VI. THE CHURCH OF ROME'S TRAFFIC IN PARDONS, considered in Three Letters, addressed to the Rev. T. L. Green. Roman Catholic Priest of Tixall. By George Hodson, M.A., Vicar of the adjoining Parish of Colwich, and Archdeacon of Stafford.	115
The Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing but the Truth. The Catholic Church vindicated, in Two Letters, addressed to the Venerable George Hodson, M.A., Protestant Vicar of Colwich, Archdeacon of Stafford, Canon Residentiary of Lichfield, etc. In reply to his Pamphlet, entitled, "The Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons." By the Rev. T. L. Green, Catholic Clergyman of Tixall.	
VII. ENGLISH SCHOLARSHIP—The Speeches of Lord Brougham. Philological Museum and Quarterly Journal of Education. Critical Works and Correspondence of Bentley	145
VIII. THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION	175
IX. ANTIQUITY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH COMPARED WITH THE NOVELTY OF THE ROMISH—ORIGINAL DIALOGUES.	
1. The Churches of Rome and England compared in their declared Doctrines and Practices. By Richard Mant, D.D. Bishop of Down and Connor.	
2. The Church of England a Faithful Witness against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome. By the Rev. R. Meek.	
3. Protestantism the Old Religion—Popery the New; or Protestantism as old as the Bible, and Popery the Corruption of the Seventh Century. By the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, M.A.	
4. The Variations of Popery. By Samuel Edgar,	
1. The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrines contained in the Profession of Faith published by Pope Pius IV.	
2. An Abstract of the Douay Catechism: revised, improv-	

CONTENTS.

- ed, and recommended, by authority, for the use of
the Faithful in the four districts of England.
3. An Essay on the Principles and Practices of the
Catholic Church 187
- X. 1. TRACTS FOR THE TIMES. By Members of the
University of Oxford.

OPPONENTS :

2. The authority of Traditions in Matters of Religion. By
the Rev. George Holden, M.A.
3. Not Tradition, but Revelation. By Phillip N. Shuttle-
worth, D.D., Warden of the New College Oxford,
and Rector of Foxley, Wilts.
4. The Popery of Oxford confronted, disavowed, and repu-
diated. By Peter Maurice, M.A. (late of Jesus
College), Chaplain of New and All Souls' Colleges,
and Officiating Minister of Kennington, Berks.
5. Modern High Church Principles examined.
6. A Brief Examination of Professor Keble's Visitation
Sermon, entitled "Primitive Tradition recognized in
Holy Scripture," and preached in the Cathedral of
Winchester. By Wm. Wilson, D.D. Prebendary.
7. Letters on the Writings of the Fathers of the two first
centuries. By Misopapisticus.

PARTISANS.

8. Remains of the late Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A.
Fellow of the Oriel College, Oxford.
9. A Sermon preached at the primary Visitation of the
Bishop of Ripon. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D. . 267

GENERAL LITERATURE.

- The Reformation a Direct Gift of Divine Providence. . . 246
- Scriptural Studies 250
- The Claims of our Colonies 256
- A Funeral Sermon. By the Rev. Krishna Mohana Banerjee. 259
- The Obligations of the National Church 263
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 274
- Travels in the Three Great Empires of Austria, Russia,
and Turkey 251
- A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Ripon 265
- A Brief View of Ecclesiastical History 267
- The Altar Service 267
- Select Prayers 267

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

- The Proposed General Union of Dissenters for the Pro-
motion of Religious Equality 271
- Queen's College, Bath 272
- Roman Catholicism 272
- The Working of the New Poor Law 278
- On the Law of Libel 274

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
I. PAPISTICAL TENDENCY OF THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.	
Tracts for the Times. By members of the University of Oxford	281
II. THE STATE OF IRELAND.	
1. A digest of the evidence taken before Select Committees of the two Houses of Parliament, appointed to inquire into the State of Ireland ; 1824-1825. With Notes, historical and explanatory, and a Copious Index. By the Rev. William Phelan, B. D., and the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, A. M.	
2. The Achill Mission, and the general Statement delivered by the Rev. Edward Nangle, at a meeting of the Protestant Association, held at Exeter Hall, Friday, December 28th, 1838.	
3. Letters from Ireland, MDCCCXXXVII. By Charlotte Elizabeth.	
5. Authentic Reports of the two great Protestant Meetings held at Exeter Hall, London, on Saturday, June 20, and Saturday, July 11, 1835, to prove to Protestants of all denominations, by authentic documents, the real tenets of the Church of Rome, as now held by the Roman Catholic Priests and Bishops of Ireland.	
5. The uses of the Established Church to the Protestantism and Civilization of Ireland. By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M. P.	
6. Evils of the State of Ireland ; their causes and their Remedy—a Poor law. By John Revans.	
7. Ireland : its evils traced to their source. By the Rev. James R. Page.	

8. Irish Tranquillity under Mr. O'Connell, my Lord Mulgrave, and the Romish Priesthood. By Anthony Meyler, M. D., M. R. I. A.
9. The Protestant Penny Magazine.
10. The Catholic Directory and Annual Register, for the year 1839. 310

III. PROTESTANT NONCONFORMITY.

- The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England, from the Reformation under Henry VIII. By Thomas Price, D. D. 347

IV. RURAL LIFE.

- Gleanings in Natural History. By Edward Jesse, Esq., F. L. S. 370

V. PORTRAIT OF AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN.

- Portrait of an English Churchman. By the Rev. William Gresley, M. A. 387

VI. ENGLISH SCHOLARSHIP—ITS RISE, PROGRESS, AND DECAY.

- The Speeches of Lord Brougham.
The Philological Museum, and Quarterly Journal of Education.
The Critical Works and the Correspondence of Bentley . 398

VII. BUBBLES OF CANADA.

- The Bubbles of Canada. By the author of "The Clock-maker."
A Narrative. By Sir Francis B. Head, Bart. 426

VIII. CHURCH EXTENSION.

- Proposals for the Creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of additional Churches in the Metropolis. By C. J. Lord Bishop of London. . . . 454

IX. THE SESSION OF PARLIAMENT.

1. A Glance at Public Affairs; with a few Suggestions to the Conservatives of Great Britain. By the Author of "Thoughts on the State and Prospects of Conservatism."
2. Political Prophecy fulfilled; or "Ireland." with a new Preface. By George Stephens. 468

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Beginnings of a New School of Metaphysics	498
A Key to the Hebrew Scriptures, &c.	499
Diatessaron ; or, the History of our Lord Jesus Christ	500
Lectures Explanatory of the Diatessaron ; or, the History of our Lord Jesus Christ	500
Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Refor- mation in Poland, and of the influence which the Scriptural Doctrines have exercised on that country in literary, moral, and political respects	501
The History of the Church of Christ, from the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, to the 18th Century	502
Parallel Universal History ; being an Outline of the History of the World ; divided into periods	502
The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, an In- quiry, in which the received title of the Greek Epistle is Vin- dicated against the cavils and objections, ancient and modern, from Origen to Sir J. D. Michaelis, chiefly upon grounds of in- ternal evidence, hitherto unnoticed, comprising a Comparative Analysis of the style and structure of this Epistle, and of the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul, tending to throw light upon their interpretation	503
A New Method of Learning to Read, Write, and Spell a Language in six months	506
The Protestant Memorial. Strictures on a Letter addressed by Mr. Pugin to the supporters of the Martyrs of Oxford. . . .	506
Dionysius Longinus on the Sublime, chiefly from the text of Weisla.	507
An Introduction to the Translation of English Poetry into Latin Elegiacs and Hexameters.	507
Madmoments or first Verseattempts by a Bornnatural, addressed to the lightheaded of society at large. , ,	507
Instruction for the Relief of the Sick Poor in some Diseases of frequent occurrence ; addressed to a Parochial Clergyman resi- ding at a distance from professional aid.	508

The Psalms of David, arranged to Chants, which are carefully selected to suit the general expression of each Psalm.	509
A Collection of Glees, Madrigals, Rounds, Quartets, Eligies, &c.	509
Proverbial Philosophy ; a Book of Thoughts and Arguments, originally treated.	503
Bellingham ; or, Narrative of a Christian in search of the Church.	511
Ecclesiastical Commision. A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, with considerations on the Letter of the Bishop of Lincoln, and the charges of the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Gloucester and Bristol.	513
Pictures of the World, at Home and Abroad.	516
Francia's Reign of Terror.	516
A General Outline of the Animal Kingdom.	517
Eve Effingham ; or, Home.	517
The Navy. Letter to his Grace the Duke of Wellington, K. G., upon the actual Crisis of the Country in respect to the State of the Navy.	518
Greece : Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical.	518
Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada.	519
The Huguenot, a tale of the French Protestants.	522
America and the American Church.	522
Increase of Popery	522

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Church and the Government.	524
The Ballot.	528
Additional Proofs of the Papistical Tendency of the Oxford Tracts	533
National Education.	533
Gloucester and Bristol Diocesan Church Building Association. :	535

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, MDCCCXXXIX.

ART. I.—*The Doctrine of the Deluge, vindicating the Scriptural Account from the Doubts which have recently been cast upon it by Geological Speculations.* By the Rev. L. VERNON HARCOURT. In two vols. London: Longman and Co. 1838.

EVERY day convinces us of the increasing necessity of vindicating the Scriptures from the presumptuous pretensions of that rank infidelity, which, under the specious name of Geology, has not blushed to question the veracity of that primitive history of the earth, which we and all preceding ages have acknowledged as the inspired Word of God. We, therefore, gladly undertook an examination of Mr. Harcourt's volumes; and wishing the antidote to be as extensive as the poison, we hoped, in vain, that they would have thoroughly refuted the blasphemous dicta of Geologists.

In the introductory chapter, we observe a long excursus on Etymology, especially on the modified forms of identical words; we cannot deny, that Professor Jäkel, who in one part is Mr. Harcourt's leading authority, has displayed ingenuity, and often discrimination; nevertheless, no inconsiderable number of the instances is incorrect from the mere want of retracing the terms to a higher source. The various modes in which Europeans have expressed Asiatic names, are cited, as examples of variation, yet incorrectly: for the characters intended to be thus expressed remain the same in the original tongues, and no fact can be adduced from the arbitrary folly of those who have clothed them at random in a foreign dress. Great errors, in the exhibi-

tion of Sanscrit and Persian terms, are of continual occurrence, and the primitive senses are very incorrectly given.

In the mythological researches, an indefatigable industry is exemplified; but the writer is biassed in favour of the systems of Bryant and Faber, and sees Noah and the Ark in almost every tradition. The matter is yet very valuable, inasmuch as it is convertible to other purposes, which will bear a sterner criticism; but the arguments are vitiated by the Etymologies. Almost every page convinces us that Mr. Harcourt is not acquainted with the Eastern tongues, which have lent their aid to his investigations. If he had only sufficiently acquainted himself with the characters and the leading rules of the respective grammars to have consulted the lexica, his opinions would have been altered on many points.

We must, however, commence a partial analysis. The chapter on the permanence of antient superstitions and usages is curious. The great pilgrimage, which Herodotus records to have taken place to the temple of Serapis, at Canopus, now Aboukir, continues, though directed to a different object, to the present time; and although instead of pagans going to their temple, the Turks visit the tombs of their santons, and the Copts the churches of their saints; the licentious songs and dances, which appear to have originated with the Egyptians, and were festive accompaniments to these occasions, are not abolished. The superstition also of children wearing small stones about their necks, mentioned by Pausanias 1,700 years ago, was observed by Dr. Clarke at Orchomenus. A tradition of the brazen serpent, which Moses erected in the Wilderness, equally singular, is commemorated. The charm, too, by which the Athenian maidens, of the present day, endeavour at a certain spot on the east bank of the Ilissus to ascertain their future husbands on the first evening of the new moon, is the remnant of a superstition in honour of Venus, whose statue formerly stood on that very spot. At Anna, now Castrogiovanni, in Sicily, the spot where the Temple of Proserpine was built, the scene of her rape having been the borders of a lake five miles off, where Ceres annually came from her temple, on the opposite side of the city to visit her daughter, the custom has not perished; for the Madonna is annually removed from the Chiesa della Madre to that of the Padri Reformati, staying there fifteen days, so that "the Virgin Mary has in this case succeeded not only to the honours, but even to the name of Ceres, for the Greeks call her Demeter."

It is well observed, that in Greece the remnants of the old idolatry are like a *Codex Palimpsestus*, "on which, though the

writing is erased, yet the marks of it are sufficiently visible to the observant eye." Thus the priests of Scamnya, a village, on the 20th day of every June, perform mass on the highest point of Olympus; and on Mount Hymettus, where once were a temple of Venus and a fountain, supposed to facilitate parturition, there is now a monastery, to which at particular seasons the Greek women repair; "and the priest told Chandler, that a dove, which it will be recollected was the bird sacred to Venus, is seen to fly down from heaven to drink of the water annually at the feast of Pentecost." The dove having been sacred to Venus, the accommodation is evident.

At Rome the names of the idols have been retained, as if the Romanists were desirous of stamping idolatry most legibly upon their religion. Middleton affirms, that he saw an altar erected to St. Baccho and other pagan saints, whom he enumerates, as Quirinus, Romula, Concordia, Nympha, and Mercurius. The burning of candles is referred, by Mr. Harcourt, to the festival at Sais. It is also maintained, that up to the time of the Reformation the antient rites of Diana were substantially, though not avowedly, performed in London, when on a certain day the head of a wild beast fixed on the point of a long spear, accompanied by the noise of hunters' horns, was brought into St. Paul's great church. To this be it added, that St. Paul's was originally built by Ethelbert, King of Kent, on the site of a Temple of Diana the huntress. In the practice of perambulating the boundaries of parishes in rogation week, Mr. Harcourt adverts to the procession in honour of the god Terminus; and in the pancake of Shrove-Tuesday to the feast in the Fornicalia, "appointed to commemorate the manner in which bread was baked before the invention of the oven by the deified Fornax." In the festivities of May-day he perceives the Floralia; in the Christmas-holidays the Saturnalia. In the decorations of churches and houses with evergreens, Chandler detects Druidism, and states the *original* object to have been, that the Sylvan spirits might repair to the domestic hearths and remain unnipped by frost and cold winds, until the return of a milder season should restore them to their favourite haunts. The misletoe is likewise retraced to paganism. The custom, which prevailed in the time of Louis XIV., of a man personating a prince, called Roifollet, going into the woods at Christmas, and bawling *ou gui menez*, analogous to that of the Guiscarts of Edinburgh, who were disguised persons, that shouted *hay menay*, has been retraced to corruptions of the lunar worship and *ἁγία μήνη* or sacred moon. We however have not sufficient fancy to enable us to recognize in Maid Marian and the Morris-dance Miriam the prophetess and her dancing

women. Candlemas is referred to the pagan custom of parading Rome "with torches and candles brenning in worship of Februa, for hope to have the more help and succour of her son Mars;" this custom is expressly and authoritatively asserted to have been accommodated to Christianity by Pope Sergius. The pontifical practice of hallowing *convenient* things is well known.

The grey peas of Midlent-Sunday or Carlin-Sunday are retraced as to their origin to the Charwoche (here improperly called Karrwochen) or Passion-week, the week commemorative of the divine satisfaction made for punishment due; but we do not perceive with the author, that it is on this account a remnant of an old heathen superstition. The distribution of pulse on the 12th of March, in the old Roman Calendar, is compared to the pagan distribution of beans at funerals; which the Flamen Dialis was not even allowed to touch, on whose flowers letters of woe, like Ovid's *âi*, *âi*, were inscribed, sympathizing with the dead. The Good Friday-bun is averred to be the Grecian *βοῦν*, explained by Julius Pollux and Hesychius to be a cake with horns; and Easter as deduced from Eostre, commemorates the name of one of the idols of our ancestors. Ochus Bochus, the magician, and Necus the demon, claim the origin of Hocus Pocus and Old Nick: though we have always understood the former to have been a corruption of *Hoc est corpus* in the Roman Catholic service. The Scotch custom of lifting the bride over the threshold has been retraced by Sir Walter Scott to the ceremony observed at Rome, in commemoration of the rape of the Sabines; and the sweet cake baked on this occasion is also referred to the classic rite. As the antients held, that only bad women were married in the month of May, so the Scottish, even of better rank, avoid that month. Mr. Harcourt has cited many other remarkable instances, in which the visible proof of paganism stands forth; but thinking that he has not thoroughly penetrated the superstition respecting towers, we refer him to Faber's *Archæologie der Hebræer*. The triple bathings, the triple circumambulations of cairns, attended with circumvolutions performed with the course of the sun, the belief of medicinal virtues attached to particular waters, and the like were decidedly pagan, and are vigorously existent in some of the eastern parts of the world. We dismiss the extraordinary detections of the flood, which the writer discerns in there things, as really unworthy of serious criticism; and we wish that we could, in compliment to his industry, withhold our remarks. We shall indeed elsewhere pretermitt many parts, of which we do not approve: but shall not omit to bring the valuable to open light: yet

though abhorring the mere snarlings of cynical criticism, we must not entirely be deterred from the expression of our opinions.

The identity of certain Hindu and Celtic superstitions is properly noticed. The idea of regeneration, obtained by passing through natural fissures in Hindustan and Ireland, discloses an uniformity of origin : and both we conceive to have branched out of the Lingapuja and Yonipuja, which were prevalent at one time both in the east and west. We are far from being satisfied that in the pagan mysteries the Hierophants connected the notion with the Deluge ; although, when the term became applied to a sublimer doctrine, the Scriptures typically connected the doctrine with it. We give Bryant all credit for his extensive learning ; but we cannot see any where in the pagan idea of regeneration *any certain reference* to the Ark. We exceedingly regret, that this fancy should have clouded the intellect of scholars. We grant, that memorials of the Ark were scattered all over the world ; but we cannot admit, that almost every tradition in the world had a reference to the Ark ; and as philologers, we sternly protest against the very ungrammatical process by which the notion has been supported. We must be excused for frequently recurring to this one point ; for it is very galling to us to perceive attempts to deduce facts from the evidence of languages, which the works prove to be unknown to the writers.

The custom at Llandegla, in Derbyshire, of patients in epilepsy after sunset washing in the well of St. Thecla, after an offering of a few pence, thrice walking round it, thrice repeating the Lord's prayer, entering the Church, getting under the Communion-table, putting a Bible under their heads, covered with a carpet or cloth, resting there till day-break, and then, having made an offering of sixpence, and *leaving a fowl in the Church*, which had been previously carried round the well, departing,—has not been inaptly compared to the antient sacrifice of a *cock* to Æsculapius, to the three-fold revolution round the mystic waters, to the heathen sanctuary and sacred cave, for which the Communion-table is here substituted.

“ The threefold circumgyration round cairns and chapels, with a view to the recovery of health, is said to be still practised in Scotland ; at least it was not long ago ; and Martin of the Isles mentions the same ceremony having been performed round himself by a baggar, in token of respect and gratitude.”

This custom, which still exists in India, and is enjoined in the Hindu sacred books, is of the remotest antiquity : Pindar, in his first Olympic, alludes to it, where he is speaking of the tomb of Pelops ; and the terms of the Hebrew Bible lead us to suppose, that the altar of Jehovah was circumambulated. That water

should have been accounted by the Scottish Celts an emblem of purification on Beltane-morning is not extraordinary; for it was so accounted all over the earth. Euripides says,

Θάλασσα κλύζει πάντατ' ἀνθρώπων κάκα

which was by no means a notion confined to the Greeks:—Jews, Mohammedans, and all, whatever might have been their religion, attached to water a purificatory efficacy: every where it was an ἁγνισμός: but, in the Christian religion it is the emblem of a Sacrament. If we transport ourselves in idea to a torrid region, one of the causes will be apparent. The ceremonies also of the first of May, which the author notices, were those of the Huli-festival still observed in India; and Ovid, in his *Fasti*, has cited a correspondent practice. The irregularities in different places, as to the time of keeping these σωζόμενα of more antient days, present no difficulty:—for the coincidence in ceremony is a full proof of the common origin.

These remarks are intended as introductions to the general proof. The next process is an endeavour to show, that the Patriarchs were deified in India, beginning with Noah and his sons. We grant, that deified ancestors were one of the most fruitful sources from which the idolatrous regions of Polytheism were supplied; but we are often in want of historic guides to enable us accurately to separate them from those which the original Sabæism equally provided. Every hypothesis in explanation of the vast extent of idolatry merits unbiassed attention; yet few will be found, from defect of evidence, to rise above the rank of probable conjecture. Mr. Harcourt has adduced opinions, that the Menus, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva were mythological personages, who were in real history Noah and his sons; but the point is not demonstrated with sufficient perspicuity to enforce a general assent. We here again wish that this writer had confined himself to one system of orthography or the other in the Asiatic names; for in one place seeing them according to Gilchrist's system, at another according to no system at all, at another according to that of Sir William Jones, we become continually perplexed. Many of his conjectures also should have been spared, such as the probable identity of *Sradd'ha* and *Vratta*, of *Yamalaya* and *Himalaya*, which cannot be admitted, and are impossible. He further declares, that the Mahab'harata, which he calls *Mahaberit*, states Hind to have been one of the sons of Ham: this very astonishing statement, which we beg leave to doubt, should have been supported by a quotation of the passage. As to his proposed origin of Hindustan, he seems not to be aware, that the Sanscrit writers call Hindustan by a

totally different name. This conjectural son of Ham, viz. Hind, he as oddly identifies with Phut,* in whom he again discerns Budd'ha, supporting his notion by the vulgar and barbarous pronunciations and hypotheses which Upham and Moor have detailed. These etymological speculations are as trifling as the derivation of *vaûs* and *vâos* from Noah, "*because he was master of the ship, and that ship was long considered the most sacred place of worship.*" This sort of frivolity corrupts all the good matter in the work. The errors are, in this respect, often exceedingly gross: treating, for instance, of the impression of Budd'ha's foot, though he had just noticed the *Shri Padam* in Ceylon, Mr. Harcourt says, "in the Indian Archipelago, one of the gods is called *Seri Pada*, which seems to be a connecting link between Pater and Budd'ha." The most simple observation, it might have been thought, would have convinced him, that the name was either the same as that in Ceylon, or that, *if there was this link between Pater and Budd'ha*, there was a typographical error, and *Pitri* should have been the word. But even then, the connection with *Shri Padam* would be required to dovetail the conjecture. The metamorphoses recorded by Ovid are far less surprising than those which Oriental words have undergone in this work.

Hitherto we have not discerned any thing which affects the speculations of Geologists: not any thing but a continuation of the reveries of Bryant, Faber, and Davies, has met our eyes. Hypothesis is so plentifully mixed with every part, and things between which there never was a connection are so strangely united—languages are so bent to particular purposes in defiance of their grammatical capabilities—and the aid of the Hebrew is so queerly sought, where it could never have had an influence, that we can perceive but little use to which this part can be applied, beyond that of a collection of mythological traditions. But even here the pruning process must be fearlessly administered, and the Etymologies must be rejected. As a refutation of Geologists, there never was a book more misnamed; for, beyond the traditional evidence of the Deluge, it does not affect the theory, and even then can scarcely be said to affect it. Throughout reason has run wild, and required the critic's chain.

Throwing aside these most obscure attempts to impart light, we shall in other parts find a great deal calculated to interest us, such as the disquisition on Dardanus: but in that on Danaus we are again entangled in the old web of absurdity. In the flood of Deucalion the agreement between parts of the Mosaic and Ovidian accounts is exhibited, just as preceding writers had

* Rosienmüller has retraced the Mauritanians to Phut.

noticed them; and here the evidence is too distinct to be mistaken. The subject is the same; consequently, a similarity of particulars might be expected: but when that similarity is not only sought in totally different subjects, and actually, as it were by the rack, forced from them in defiance of all probability and internal proof, the reviewer must be sadly wanting in his duty to the public, who will approve the torturing process. When we read, that the Pelasgi in *an improvement* on a quotation from Gillies, were the family of Inachus, the son of Io or Isis, "*the Moon or Ark*;" and that the Hellenes were the descendants of Hellen, the son Deucalion, "*the Man of the Ark*," we have the *Man of the Moon*, of whom we heard much in our nurseries, joined to *the Man of the Ark*. We cannot resist proposing a vulgar question: is not this *moonshine*?

Though Mr. Harcourt affirms (whence informed, we know not) that Nycteus was the name given *from the darkness of the Ark*, which nevertheless the Scriptural account has furnished with capabilities for the admission of light, he is remarkably sparing of his information about the Pelasgi. Seeing the flood in every thing, whether on the earth, in the heavens above the earth, or in the regions below the earth, he accounts Pelasgi to have been merely Pelagus, *and the Sigma to have been only inserted to lengthen the syllable*. What a singular Etymological Dictionary might be contrived on Mr. Harcourt's principles! It is, however, very clear, either that the Pelasgi could not be twisted to his purpose, or that he knew nothing about them; for he says, "it is evident, that Pelasgic was no distinction of country, but of religion; and accordingly Homer numbers Pelasgi among the Trojan forces as well as among the Greeks:"—if the term were merely indicative of religion, could Homer have made this bipartite enumeration, when he was speaking not of religion, but of warriors? And has it not occurred to Mr. Harcourt, that if we have no remaining evidence, that the Pelasgi were a nation properly so called, they yet might have been roving tribes? Their religion and their language seem to have been allied to those of India.

Mr. Harcourt continually appeals to the Hebrew; and it is self-evident that he accepts it as the original language to which all others should be referred; yet he does not sufficiently compare its words with their various occurrences and alliance to words in the cognate dialects. Our readers will not wish us to imitate the labour of Hercules in the stables of Augeas; otherwise we could fill the whole of this and of our next number in commenting on the Etymologies. We shall therefore omit almost the whole of this department.

It is with great sorrow that we are forced to make these observations, from the conviction which they afford to us, that if Mr. Harcourt would purify his mind from inordinate fancifulness, and only see Noah and the ark in their genuine counterparts, and not strain languages beyond their power, he might do an important service to Literature.. As it is, the task of reviewing a book, where philological errors meet the eye in almost every page, where conjecture runs wild, and the judgment is muzzled, is really almost insupportable ; more especially as a coincidence, or a fancied coincidence of sound, or a forced combination of discordant legends, is elevated to the place of argument. It is a most useless display of the gauntlet to the confessedly clever men, whose geological speculations every sound Christian must controvert. In the exact proportion that we hate the possibility of attaching ridicule to a serious subject, do we wish that these two volumes had been more discreetly written ; and we are much surprised to read in Vol. I. p. 238, that Sir William Drummond *had no theory to support*. If Mr. Harcourt had read Sir William Drummond's *Œdipus Judaicus*, and some of his papers in the *Classical Journal*, he could not have failed to detect *the theory of the Deist* in Sir William Drummond.

There is confessedly much learning, and there are evidences of an indefatigable research in the discussion of the stars in Job ; but the violent manner in which everything is forced into a commemoration of the Deluge, is like leaven leavening the whole lump. In the chapter on Hercules, we approach a geological question. Noticing the geological and chronological inconsistency of the conjecture, that a volcanic eruption from the Cynian isles opened the passage through the Bosphorus, which is fifteen miles in length, and that the earthquakes accompanying it separated Olympus from Ossa, at the distance of more than 300 miles, and so gave a passage to the Peneus, and Mr. Olivier's assertion that the banks of the Bosphorus, on both sides, through an extent of several leagues, are of volcanic structure, Mr. Harcourt says :—

“ No Geologist will admit the agency of recent volcanoes in their formation ; for the rocks are porphyry and trap, containing jasper, cornelians, chalcedonies, and agates. This is exactly the description of the rocks near the source of the Coquet, in Northumberland, belonging to the Cheviot range ; and yet no one ever dreamed that they were symptoms of post-diluvian volcanic action. In the next place, even granting what it would be ridiculous to suppose, that these rocks were the production of a recent volcano, still it is not very obvious, how so long a passage could be opened through them merely by a fresh eruption. They might, indeed, be closed by a stream of lava, more pro-

ditions than any on record ; but in that case, a vast temporary inundation must have been occasioned behind, in addition to that which would result afterwards from the removal of the mass, if such a thing were possible ; for the level of the water would be raised till they found a vent somewhere. But this is in direct opposition to another part of his* hypothesis, which assumes, that till it broke loose, in the time of Deucalion, the Euxine had always occupied an extent nearly equal to that of the Mediterranean ; but, in consequence of the vast weight of water which they had to sustain, the banks of the Isthmus gave way, and the coasts of Asia and the plains of Samothrace were inundated."

Against this theory of de la Malle it is urged, that—

1. "The mass of waters continually added to the Euxine by the many rivers that feed it, must, from the very first, have found their passage through the lowest of the vallies intersecting the hills that surround it, and worked themselves channels, which would gradually lower its level : and it is evident that other causes are quite sufficient to account for any diminution of its extent, since, by his own acknowledgement, the sea of Azoph has, since the time of Herodotus, diminished five-sixths, the Caspian one-third, and the Euxine itself was at that period thirty leagues less than in the days of Xerxes ; and yet nothing of this has been effected by any violent disruption of its banks.—2. 'That' there was a double barrier to be surmounted ; for why was the Hellespont to be open more than the Bosphorus ?—3. 'That' fifteen miles of rocks would not easily give way all at once in one narrow line.—4. 'That' the rock is in its own nature one of the hardest and strongest. But the chronological objection to his hypothesis is the most fatal of all. He fixes the event in the year 1529 B.C. Now the unanimous evidence of antiquity declares, that some centuries before that time, the Argonauts had sailed through the Bosphorus into the Euxine."

Short as is this geological excursus, it is the first and only one, that we have noticed. The vindication of the Scriptures, which the author has proposed to himself, appears chiefly to be a reference of Mythology to the Nöetic period, which, assuredly, is no vindication of them from the statements of Geologists. Some of the remarks on the Egyptian paintings and Greek mysteries are very good ; and if Mr. Harcourt had written a work on Mythology in general, without attempting to accommodate it to any pre-conceived system, he would have deserved well of Literature. His idea that No or No-amon (Nahum iii. 8-9) was Thebes, not Diospolis, disencumbered from the extravagances connected with the inquiry, is also very probable ; for the situation was "in exact conformity with the description : Upper Egypt was

* *Geographie Physique de la mer Noire*, par A. Dureau de la Malle. Paris, 1807. p. 197-211.

ready to assist her on all sides, and Nubia, or Ethiopia, not far off: and if the war had anything of a religious character, similarity of usages and traditions would bind them all together."

The Biblical criticism respecting Gad and Meni, (Isaiah lxxv. 11), where our English version is confused, though not novel, is likewise deserving of approbation:

"What the Prophet complained of was, that they had forsaken the mountain, which the Lord had sanctified by placing his name there, for other mountains, where other names were adored and rebellious sacrifices were offered. They had blasphemed Him by bestowing the name of God upon a creature of corrupt tradition, called Meni, and transferring to that ancestor, whose spirit was supposed to haunt the mountain-top, the honours due only to Jehovah."

Mr. Harcourt rightly and cogently insists, that Gad and Meni are obviously only two names for one divinity. He has also supported Lowth's idea, in Isaiah lxvi. 17, that an idol, called Achath, was intended where our version reads *one tree*, as the Syrians had an idol named Adad, which Maccobius affirms, signified also *one*: but we cannot assent to the observations which follow. The Masorites propose to read Achat; and Le Clerk conjectures Hecate to have been intended.

The chapter on the worship of fire is at strange variance with the Oriental writers, and very different from the tenor of Hyde's learned work. "*The Arkite Conflict*" is preposterous, and a vast proportion of the interpretations of Mythology is singularly queer and overstrained. We do not like the magisterial manner in which some of these interpretations are defended contrary to all authority: for instance, one of the commentators says, that the Rhyndacus was a river between Greece and the Hellespont: this suits not Mr. Harcourt, who bluntly says that the commentator knew nothing about it, and then proceeds to hunt for an untenable etymology fitted to his views! He, in three words, too, solves the difficult question of the Pelasgi, denying their name to have been Patronymic, and affirming it to have been Mythological. His decision is, "*They were Arkites!*" The classical scholar is also favoured with the remarkable information, that the *ἑνὰργῆς ταῦρος* (Trachiniæ 515), is *an Arkite bull!* Thus no language comes amiss to Mr. Harcourt, whether or not it be calculated to illustrate the research: and few are more favoured than that of Dan O'Connell's "*fine pisantry*," which is hurried through all the quarters of the globe in the exercise of its explanatory properties. The example of Vallancey has been followed, whose learning was neutralized by his exuberance of fancy. Although we may concede to the Erse the power of

other Celtic dialects, we cannot allow either to it or to them an influence over the languages of the East.

When Apollonius informs us that Hercules threw a heavy rock on the demolished hydra, (*βαρείαν ἐπέθηκε πέτραν*), Mr. Harcourt calls it a *Barian* rock, in which his allusion is to *βάρις*, a ship, (according to him, Noah's ark); but what theory may not be proved, if these outrageous liberties can be taken with an author's text? The scholiasts have given different interpretations to many of the legends which he has cited, and in the pages of the philosophers some are explained according to the opinions of their age: but Bryant, Faber, and Mr. Harcourt, to whom Vallancey and Davies may be added, have, by totally inadmissible etymologies, sought to destroy the authority of their explanations. With them everything is *Arkite*. Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and other Fathers of the Church, also discussed Pagan Mythology; but none of them directed it to this one object: and assuredly they lived at a time when its occult meaning might have been more easily ascertained than at the present. May we not exclaim, *Difficilis labor est ineptiarum*?

Yet there is so much learning scattered amidst these *ineptiæ*, and so much arduous investigation that might have been usefully applied, if the purpose had been different, that the revival of this system, which was in its day sufficiently castigated by the reviewers, induces concern; since, instead of disproving the assertions of the Geologists, it affords ample grounds for ridicule, and is at the mercy of every Orientalist. The inquiry into the mysteries in Virgil and Homer, proves what Mr. Harcourt might have done, if he had not been prepossessed with his dominant notion; the following passage is excellent—

“The descendants of Shem and Japeth had not wholly forgotten, although they wholly misunderstood, that great principle of revealed religion which constituted the hope of the patriarchs, and was the substance of their faith; that all things are purged with blood, and that without blood there is no remission of sins. The difference is very strongly marked between the Latin and Greek poet: in Virgil propitiatory offerings, indeed, are made, and holocausts are burned; but the blood is collected in vessels only to be poured again on the victim, and no virtue is ascribed to it. But in Homer's sacrifice there is a distinct acknowledgement of its efficacy: a trench is dug round the sanctuary, and filled, not with water, but with blood; and then the spirits of the dead, of every age, and from every country, hasten thither with eager longings to taste the benefits that accrue from the shedding of blood; and till they have tasted it, they hover about, uneasy and silent, and, as it were, lifeless, without the power of speech, and incapable of social intercourse. A similar acknowledgement, that blood sprinkled on the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, may be observed

in heathen usages. A Roman sacrifice, by which the Pontifex purified himself, to make propitiation for the people to the infernal deities, is thus described in a manuscript commentary on Statius, published by C. Barthius. A pit was dug, into which the priest descended; above him was laid a platform of perforated planks, on which a bull was slaughtered, and the blood of the victim streamed upon the person and the sacred vestments of the concealed priest: this was an annual ceremony. The Tauribolium was a sacrifice of the same sort, but repeated only once in twenty years, and not by the priest alone, but by any one who wished to be in a state of ceremonial purification during the whole of that period."

Here we have positive and indubitable coincidences to rites in the Mosaic law, although different in the mode of celebration, and as such they must be received. Had the memorials of the Deluge, which have been sought east, west, north, and south, been inquired after in the same discriminating manner, the author's book would have been unrivalled.

We suspect, that in the invocation of the Eleian women, preserved in Plutarch's Qu : Gr : p. 36, which he has quoted, *ἄλιον* or *ἡλίου*, should be read for *ἄλιον*, from which a different sense would result. **Ἄλιον ἐς ναὸν ἄγνόν*, as it stands in the present text, has all the appearance of a corruption. Be this, however, as it might have been, we are not sufficiently credulous to admit, that *αρχαίαν* could have meant *Arkite*, nor that "*Arca is certainly derived from ἀρχή*," which has in other places been properly referred to the Sanscrit *Arg'ha* : for, on this principle, every passage in which *ἀρχή*—*ἀρχαῖος*, &c. occur, would have also an *Arkite* sense. Thus, when God is represented to have created the heavens and the earth, *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, shall we understand that HE created them in the ARK? Sometimes indeed, *φλυαροῦσι φιλοσοφοῦντες, καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσι φλυαροῦντες*; but this *φλυαρία* is uncontrollably wild. Unfortunately, however, for the theory, the word used in the Hebrew Bible for Noah's ark is *תבה*, between which and *Arca* there is not *one* consonant in common.

As it were fitfully passing from the fanciful to the solid, in the observations on the treasury of Atreus, Mr. Harcourt has proved himself eminently qualified for Antiquarian criticisms; but his unfortunate Bryantism or Faberism continually leads him astray. When he informs us that Hu (a Nöetic title!) is retained by the Arabs, and is still used by the Turks, the persons whom he has followed as authorities have made a very simple thing a mystery: for *هو* is the Arabic pronoun, which, *of course*, is used also by the Turks and Persians, who read the Arabic Koran, and is the same as the Hebrew *הוּא* implying HE—and *κατ' ἐξοχήν* is pre-

icated of God a sa divine name. The supposition, too, that the Persian Mithras can be explained by the Chaldee Midrash, *an allegory*, is preposterous: for Mithras came from a Zend word, which, like the modern Persian *شمس* signified the Sun. Again, we have Arimanius and Oromazes for Ahriman and Ormuzd; and it is often from such abominable perversions of words, that the author seeks to deduce historic facts. He says, that the image of Mithras, in Persia, had the head of a lion. On what authority? *On Greek!* When had the Persia iconoclasts images? The Lion of Persia, however, was only *symbolical* of the Sun, and is retained in the present arms of Persia—"Shir ve Khorshid Irani"—the Persian Lion and Sun. *Græcia Mendax* is but little to be depended on respecting the Persians: Mr. Harcourt however depends on every thing which he can apply to Arkitism, and we think that an ark should be provided for the reception of all that has been written on the subject. From the time of Catcott, the Hutchinsonian, who wrote on the Deluge, to the present writer, we have had innumerable theories, and queer etymologies, darkening rather than elucidating the obscurity of Mythology.

Mr. Harcourt errs in two leading points. He depends too much on Wilford's Essays in the Asiatic Researches on the Sacred Isles of the West, in which it is known that Mr. Wilford was very much deceived, and on the strong affinity between the Celtic languages and the Sanscrit. This affinity, however, is only sufficiently strong to shew the Eastern origin of the Celts, but is not so conclusive as to authorize the introduction of any Celtic dialect into an interpretation of Eastern or Grecian words. In the German and our own language, the influence of the Sanscrit is far more clearly developed; in the Latin and Greek it is undeniable: consequently, the Sanscrit itself should have been Mr. Harcourt's chief source. Those Sanscrit words which he has admitted, have a most barbarous representation in our character, and have in different places such absolutely arbitrary, and such varied forms, that all his etymological labours on them are necessarily lost. He evidently does not know the laws of permutation in Sanscrit grammar, nor the principles on which Sanscrit terms become modified in the colloquial dialects: but until he be master of these points, it is idle to apply the Sanscrit to other languages. At all events, the Celtic, *as a source of Etymology*, is inadmissible. Mr. Harcourt, however, has laboured severely to substantiate Wilford's hypothesis respecting the British Isles, and deserves credit for his ingenuity: he has certainly silenced the defendants of the claims of the Azores; and brought forward valid authority in support

of their Hyperborean position. But as our scholars in India have been too communicative in proposing their questions to wary Brahmans, as the deception respecting Shem, Ham, and Japheth played on Sir William Jones assures us, we suspect, that Mr. Wilford's inquiries respecting the Fortunate Isles or Islands of the Blessed, may have given the clue to the Brahmans to compliment the masters of their country by the production of another ingenious forgery;—and such the fact is generally suspected to have been. The learning which Mr. Harcourt has shewn, nevertheless, renders this part of the work very valuable, and his explanation of Plato's Atlantis, and of the errors of ancient geographers is exceedingly deserving of attention. From an examination of the writers quoted in the notes, and a judicious comparison of Celtic and Hindù deities and customs, a very amusing and desirable work might be composed.

We must give a short abstract of this part. After a production of the ancient notices of Britain, &c., Mr. Harcourt cites Artemidorus, to prove that Ceres and Proserpine were worshipped in an island near Britain, with the same rites as in Samothrace, and quotes the Hippolytus of Euripides to shew that the dwelling of the Hesperides was where the ruler of the ocean allows no further progress to mariners, thence inferring, that Euripides supposed the residence of the Hesperides to have been situated far to the north. Strabo's assertion that there was no sailing from Celtice to the north beyond Ierne (Ireland), explains the idea. Tzetzes did not doubt that the Cerne of Lycophron was Britain; and our author sees the name in Cornwall, whither the Phœnicians traded for tin. Now, Dionysius, whom Priscian translated, says, "Opposite to the promontory, which is called Sacred, and is considered the extreme point of Europe to the west, the Hesperides, full of tin, are situated, inhabited by the brave Iberians." Although these Hesperides were supposed to have been over against Hesperia or Spain, our author thinks it very clear that their islands were the British islands, attributing much of the confusion to the ambiguous application of Celtice to two very distant portions of the European coast. He hence conjectures the cause of the vast extent which Plato gave to his Atlantis, and that of Pliny introducing Æthiopia in this direction (if the common reading be genuine), to be equally easy of elucidation. Homer mentions two branches of Æthiopians: one under the rising, the other under the setting sun; "and as it has been shewn that the eastern branch was an insular people in the Nile, so it may be concluded that the western branch was an insular people in the Atlantic, of which the Nile was maintained by some to be an arm." They also came from the Hyperborean country. The

Æthiopians, therefore, who came from the north to Erytheia, were those who formed the expedition of Hercules to the Hesperides: but as Hercules imposed a severe toil upon his crew, "not only every continental site for the Hesperides, whether in Africa or Europe, is necessarily set aside, but every island too near the Straits of Gibraltar, or that could be reached from thence without a long voyage." One of the principal arguments by which Mr. Harcourt identifies the situation with Britain is, that the islands were called Gorgades, as well as Hesperides, and that the Gorgons were the progeny of Keto, in whom he sees the British Kêd or Ceridwen.

The next attempt is to shew, that Hesiod's Tartarus was the British Isles. Strabo fixes Tartarus in the extreme west, not of Africa, but of Europe; and when Hesiod relates the defeat of the Titans, he sometimes calls their place of banishment the dark west, sometimes the gloomy Tartarus. Tzetzes, the scholiast, has expressly named Britain; but, with deference to Mr. Harcourt, the passage bears internal marks of a forgery. Mr. Metivier, on the other hand, has adduced from some old ecclesiastical records, that Jersey was called "The Holy Gate," and Guernsey "The Holy, Blessed, and Fortunate Island." The copper tools, supposed to have been formed by the ancient Egyptians to work the gold-mines on the Red Sea, which Agatharcides states to have been discovered in some deep galleries, this writer refers to Hesiod's brazen age, and thinks the copper tools of the Celts which have been found to have been of an equal antiquity. He argues, that since tin and iron were used by Homer's heroes on the plains of Troy, the intercourse which exported the former into the Mediterranean, must have introduced a knowledge of the latter to the British Celts. Demetrius distinctly asserted that the Islands of the Blessed were the British Islands (*τῶν περὶ τὴν Βριττανίαν νήσων*), and that the inhabitants of one of them were deemed by the other Britons, sacred and inviolable.

Mr. Harcourt proceeds to insist, that Britain was visited by the Argonauts, and that the crew of Jason's ship were well acquainted with Ireland. The whole of the following particulars is so exceedingly similar to the critical principles, of which we have strongly disapproved, that we must consign it to those who approve the theory. Nevertheless, things so exceedingly startling occur, that we are forced, against our wills, to notice certain assumptions or hypotheses. When Mr. Harcourt would make his readers believe, that the Sanscrit words *Jambu* and *Sambu*, though composed of different radicals, are synonyms, that *Jamma* is *perhaps* derived from *Jamim* "the mountain of waters," and

may be recognized in the Arabian festival *Giuma*, where he has apparently followed an Italian author; and when the note informs us that this *Jamim* is nothing more than the Hebrew *Yamaim*, which mean *waters*, and never meant “*a mountain of waters*,” as this branch of the Oriental languages has a character answering to our *j*, which the Hebrew has not, it is manifest, that there can be no possible relation between *Jamma* and *Yamaim*, and that the Italianized *Giuma* is equally distinct, since it comes from the root *جمع* the first letter corresponding to our *j*, the last to the Hebrew *y*. It is this utter disregard of grammar which we abominate in these Arkite researches, and which exposes the theory to ridicule. Thus Medina is forced to Mahdeenah, a Persian word (which we would have written Mahdin) *the moon of religion*; but as we cannot allow a Persian etymology to an Arabian place, which in pure Arabic means a city, and here the city *καρ' ἐφοχῆν*, we must treat the etymology as absurd. With the same recklessness Mr. Harcourt would explain *جبل النور jibbel'unnawr*—*the hill of light*, near Mecca, by implication as *the hill of Noah*; as if an Oriental could have possibly blundered between the sounds of *نور* and *نوح*. In the same loose way he calls the mountains of the moon *El Gibel Gumhr*, instead of *Jibbel 'ul Kamr*.

As the matter continues to be much of the same description as that on which we have descanted, we shall pass over a considerable portion of the Arkite system. For, it is obvious, that the words have not been retraced to their sources, and that all the barbarous metamorphoses of sounds which travellers have made, or uncritical men have conjured up, have been received in valid evidence by Mr. Harcourt, without an examination. His really solid learning, where the dominant theory does not mislead him, makes us sorry to write remarks, which the indignity inflicted on philology extorts from us. On the subject of the Cairns, for instance, he is very luminous, excepting where he deteriorates his learning by impossible etymologies. We observe, too, that he has quoted the verses which Davies found in a Welsh ode, in the *Myfyrian Archæology*, and pronounced to be foreign—which Mr. Faber instantaneously averred to be Hebrew. The words are

O Brithi Brithoi
Nu oes nu edi
Brithi Brithani
Sych edi edi euroi.

We also observe that Mr. Harcourt has divided some of the words to suit his purpose differently from their form in the *Myfyrian Archæology*. His conjectured Hebrew is—

הוי בריתי ברית חי
 נח יש נח עדי :
 בריתי ברית עין?חי
 סך עדי עדי הרמה :

which he thus renders :—

Ho ! my Covenant is the Covenant of life.

Noah——Noah is my witness.

My Covenant is the Covenant of the Fountain of life ;

The shrine is my witness : the Prophet is my witness.

Doubting the translation of סך, and considering the utter improbability of such words occurring in a pagan poem—words too received from their ancestors, who have been proved to have been related to the Indian order, we cannot admit this Hebrew version. It has been shewn elsewhere, that Prithu-raja corresponds to Hu Gadarn, both in character and the meaning of the name, and the context of these lines implies, that they allude to a procession, like that of Osiris Gubernator Mundi. The connexion between the Celts and Hindus at some distant time being admitted, why may we not try them by the Sanscrit ? Though not in pure Sanscrit idiom, they would stand—

O Pritho ! Prithviki !

Naushu Nayaid 'hi :

*Pritho ! Pritho ! naya**

Sakhaid 'hyed 'hyā ryyah !

O mighty One ! (Prithu or Hu Gadarn) Mighty One ! come !

In the ships be thou conductor !

O mighty one, mighty one ! conduct (us)

Be our friend ! be our master !

Remembering that in the colloquial dialects P and B are continually interchanged, and B pronounced for P, and supposing the words to be Sanscrit unadorned by orthoepical rules, let us see how the rude Sanscrit and Mr. Harcourt's English expression of the Hebrew will stand :—

MR. HARCOURT'S HEBREW.

Hoi Berithi Berith Chai.

Nuach iesh nuach edi.

Berithi Berith ein chai:

Such edi : edi haroe.

ROUGH SANSKRIT.

O Pritho ! Pritho ! thi !

Naushu nay(a) ed'hi !

Pritho ! Pritho ! nay (a)

Sakh(a) ed'hi ! edhi Aryya !

* Whether *Prithanayai* or *Brithanayai* (to Britain), may have been intended in the third line must be conjectural ; as indeed the whole is : the orthographical and rude modes will each display an analogy.

It is also to be remembered, that *Aryya* is one of the titles of Budd'ha.

Much antiquarian matter is adduced on the subject of ablutions. A passage is cited from Varro, in proof that the month of February was called, from the lustrations which were then performed; the Sabine word, *Februum*, having implied purification. It is connected with the inquiry to which it is adjoined, because it was the last month of the old Roman year, in which purifications were abundant; the people not only purifying themselves with water, but lustrating, by sprinklings, their houses, temples, and even whole cities. Ovid, indeed, says, (*Fast.* ii. 35), that these ablutions were supposed to take away and cancel every crime, and prevent the cause of evil. Some regenerating efficacy was, therefore, attributed to these baptisms, sprinklings, or immersions: of which repeated proofs occur in the classics. Gorius, on the testimony of Etruscan drawings, maintains, that many years before Numa Pompilius, a baptism existed in that country. We readily grant that the catastrophe of the Deluge might have induced the idea, that sin might be expiated by water; but it is to be remembered that some of the philosophers accounted water the principle of things. Affusion, immersion, and sprinklings, were, however, undeniably religious rites, and probably were used in every region of the globe; it is certain that immersion was necessary to an initiation in the mysteries. Thus, Mr. Harcourt notices, that the Egyptians sacrificed to water, that the Persians did the same, that the Hindus offered oblations of water to the dead; that as these honour the Ganges, so the Lacedæmonians honoured the Eurotas in obedience to an express law, and the Athenians the Ilissus; and that not only the greater rivers, but even the smaller, in various parts of the world, were venerated and furnished with presiding deities. All springs, and large bodies of standing water were esteemed holy by the Romans, and provided with religious ceremonies: the Seine in France; in England, the Isis and the Ouse, have received divine honours. The custom may still be traced in the properties which the vulgar assign to certain springs. The rock-basins in Cornwall and other places stand forth, likewise, with powerful evidence. Who can recount the lustrations that might have been performed in them?

Ἀπὸ τοῦ μὲν ὕδατος, was the doctrine of Pindar; and it is most probable, that legends of the Spirit of God brooding over the primordial waters were the true origin of the religious honour given to the element. The Deluge might have strengthened these opinions: but we cannot think the Deluge to have been the origin of them. Philo conceives it to have been the inten-

tion of the Creator to purify the earth with water ; and Cicero, like Euripides, says, that all transgressions are expiated by the sea. The ablutions of the Jews were, likewise, of the highest religious importance : they were in a strong degree typical of the Christian Baptism.

“ When, therefore, John the Baptist invited sinners to the baptism of repentance, it was no novelty of his own invention ; he acted in the very spirit of the Mosaic law : it was the authorised mode of calling upon those who had broken their engagements with God to renew their vows : they were to be treated as dead men, who must be born again to a new life of holiness and obedience—dead, indeed, unto sin, but alive unto God. Well might our Lord, therefore, be astonished, that Nicodemus, who was a ruler among the Jews, should comprehend so little of the mysteries of the Mosaic law, as to misunderstand him, when he spoke of the necessity of being born again.”

Without entering into Mr. Harcourt's reasons for maintaining that the Jews associated the idea of purification with recollections of the Deluge, the typical association into which St. Peter brings it with that event, is sufficient for the admission of the fact. The illustration given of this passage is very excellent. In the Hebrew Prophets a regenerative efficacy is predicted of Baptism : the waters are living waters, waters of salvation, wells of salvation ; and the blood of Christ is called a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness. In like manner, the sprinkling of “ the blood of an unspotted, unblemished heifer, which had never borne the yoke, was a proper type of Him who never bore the yoke of sin.” As fire, likewise, was considered peculiarly pure, and purificatory of things subjected to its action, so every part of the heifer was enjoined to be burned, and its ashes to be gathered and laid up in a clean place for purification : fire, also, was selected as the emblem of the Holy Ghost at the day of Pentecost. The author suggests an ingenious reason for this ordinance—the ashes would be a perpetual memorial of the death of Him who was to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself : and blood, as the life of the animal, denoted the death of Christ,

“ For which reason all things were by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission. The main purpose was to represent the purifying power of that death in the hearts of those who receive him as their Saviour, according to the argument in Heb. ix. 13-14 ; for the ashes of the spotless heifer are here inseparably connected with a baptismal ceremony ; for it was not that the ashes themselves were sprinkled on the unclean, but the water of separation in which those ashes were steeped ; and that water is expressly declared to be a purification for sin. That sprinkling, therefore, might be considered a baptism, by which the unclean were cleansed and separated

from the pollutions of the world, and qualified to stand in the presence of God. It had the indispensable obligation of a Sacrament: and no one who omitted to observe it, after a personal contact with death, was allowed to consider himself included in the Covenant with God."

It is further remarked, that the most remarkable part of the ceremony consisted in the mediatorial character of the person who became a type of the Messiah: for, as He, who knew no sin, bare our sins in his own body on the tree, which were purged away by his blood, so the Levitical purifier of the unclean with the water of separation, was required to be previously clean; but as by that act of purifying the unclean, he became unclean himself, taking on him the uncleanness of others, he was obliged to wash his clothes and to bathe his whole body in water. Thus, it is clear, that, in this case, the sprinkling of water had the same significance as the sprinkling of blood, and was substituted for it, because the blood of the spotless victim could only be shed and sprinkled once; nevertheless, its ashes communicated an inexhaustible virtue to the water wherein they were steeped, and the sprinkling of that water could be repeated as often as it was needful. The one, viewed in this light, bore to the other the same relation as the Sacrament of Baptism bears to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. With equal ingenuity and solidity of argument, Mr. Harcourt explains 1 Pet. iii. 21, in its apparent opposition to St. Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 1, by St. Peter having referred to the mystical and symbolical baptism of the Jews:

"And thus Jewish baptism was opposed to the baptism that saves us—as the symbol to the thing symbolized—as the type to the anti-type—as the shadow to the substance."

St. Paul, on the contrary, was writing on the moral and regenerating influence of the Christian Baptism, which he describes as a cleansing from all filthiness of the flesh and *Spirit*.

Some very sensible observations on Regeneration follow this portion of the work, and are as much recommended to us by their research, as by their orthodoxy. Here the author enters into the question, when were the Apostles regenerated? and shows, that the only transaction stamped with any thing like the features of regeneration was the ceremony of washing their feet—a ceremony nearly equivalent to the Sacrament of Baptism—on the necessity of which our Saviour strongly insisted. For there were certain peculiarities in the condition of the Apostles, since they were placed in the transition from one dispensation to another, and were partakers of both, which necessarily caused some variation of that Sacrament from its subsequent institution, both outwardly and inwardly; and it is urged against those who fix St. Peter's regeneration at the day of Pentecost, that it

could not be; since he had received the Holy Ghost before its arrival: 1 John xx. 21, 22, 23.

The effect of Circumcision, expressed as the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, was analogous both in expression and effect to baptism, which was not merely putting away the filth, but the sins of the flesh, and thus cleansing the conscience. When the symbol of the initiatory Sacrament was altered, the change of state did not take place in two gradations in Gentile converts, as in those who had been first circumcised, and then admitted into the Christian covenant, but at once and completely in the ordinance of baptism, in which their old man, their old unregenerate nature expired, the body of sin was buried, and the new man was raised up in them—a new nature, as different from their former, as our glorified bodies shall be to our mortal. It is rightly stated that an invisible grace belongs to every Sacrament, and that our Lord, discussing to Nicodemus the regeneration attendant on baptism, when he said, a man must be born of water and the Spirit, not only checked presumptuous reasonings on the subject, but established its truth by his comparison of it to the wind, of the existence of which we are assured, though we cannot discern its origin, nor describe how far it reaches. St. Paul studiously associates the ideas of baptism and regeneration—“*Ye are washed; ye are sanctified*”—(1 Cor. vi. ii.) Had there been no necessary connection between them, had certain opinions of the present day on the subject been conformable to the Apostle's doctrine, the mention of *washing* might have been spared.

Every part of this subject is most sensibly treated, and makes us more than ever regret, that the work should be encumbered with its etymologies. The argument on Regeneration is acutely treated, and the inferences are stringently drawn; the orthodox doctrine of our orthodox Church, as developed in our baptismal service, which seems to have given offence to a certain Rev. Mr. Head,* who would have passed away from his mortal existence unknown, had he not daringly butted his *head* against his Bishop, the talented and excellent Bishop of Exeter, is proved against those who hold opposite opinions with a peculiar vigour and with consummate conclusiveness. In refutation of these new interpreters of the Scriptures, of these men who would understand the minds of the Apostles in a way differing from that in which they them-

* The presumptuous conduct of this innovating clergyman may be ascertained by all who will read a pamphlet, published at our Office, of which the title is *An Address of the Lord Bishop of Exeter to the Clergy of his Diocese on the conduct of the Rev. H. E. Head.*

selves understood them, Mr. Harcourt examines the doctrine according to the fathers of the three first centuries, and cogently asks :

“ Who are most competent to judge what was the meaning of the language used by the Evangelists and Apostles? Shall we consult those who lived fourteen centuries after them, or those who lived with them, and conversed with them, and were taught by them, and received from them all their knowledge of Christianity? And if no reasonable man can doubt, that their cotemporaries were the most capable of conveying to us that instruction, it follows, that those whom they instructed were in the best condition for receiving the truth, and transmitting it to their successors in return. The nearer we ascend to the fountain-head, the purer will the water flow : the three first centuries, therefore, after the Apostles, were more likely to know in what sense the Apostles themselves used a theological term, than any three centuries that have since elapsed.”

None, it would be supposed, could be found ready to controvert this sound canon of criticism; but such unfortunately there are.

The question at issue is, “ Were the first converts to Christianity in the habit of considering baptism equivalent to regeneration, and necessarily attended with some spiritual grace, or were they not?” There were doubtless some exceptions, like Simon Magus; but such *fermant regulam*. The identity of the two terms was the rule. Baptism was accounted a passage into a new life, a resurrection from death, which fundamental ideas inseparably included in them that of regeneration : it was necessary to the concinnity of language, to the harmony of metaphor in its several parts. If baptism was the commencement of a new existence to those admitted within the pale of Christianity—if Christians were born anew, as it were, of incorruptible seed, and the laver in which they were cleansed was denominated the laver of regeneration, it is most absurd to distinguish regeneration from this Sacrament.

Modern “ systems of theology have perplexed what before was simple :” we must, therefore, look to the unsophisticated Christianity of the primitive Church. Without entering into the dispute about the comparative authenticity of Barnabas, Hermas, and Clemens Romanus, since they are comprised within the period which the author has prescribed to himself in this chapter, he concedes to them the priority in the research. The first maintains, that we descend into the water full of sins and filth, but ascend from it bearing in our hearts the fruit of fear, and *direct our hopes to Jesus by THE SPIRIT*: the second declares, that we must ascend through the water to find a rest-

ing-place, because we cannot enter into the kingdom of God without laying aside the mortality of our former life, and that thus being dead to our former state, we are sealed with the seal of the Son of God, *that seal being the water, into which men descend to die and ascend out of it to live*; the third asks, *what confidence can we have of entering into the kingdom of God, unless we preserve our baptism pure and uncontaminated?* which proves, that Clemens believed, that the sanctifying grace imparted in baptism might be afterwards forfeited and lost by the defilements of the world. In the apostolical constitutions, and one of the Homilies ascribed to him, and also in the recognitions, the same doctrine is asserted.

In the second century, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, Melito, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian add their testimony to the preceding. In Justin Martyr, the language is decisive: he speaks of Christian converts, as being taken to some place where there is water, and being regenerated by the same mode of regeneration as those who preceded them—which is a direct evidence of the belief that the blessing of God was annexed to baptismal regeneration. Following doubtless the authority of St. Peter, and conforming himself to the general opinion, he typically connects the Deluge with this Sacrament, in which “Christ, being the first born of every creature, became again the head of another race *regenerated* by him through water and faith and the wood of the cross, in the same way as Noah, rising on the waters, was saved in his wooden abode.” (Dial. cum Tryph. p. 229.) This also is the view which our Church takes of it in the baptismal service; and as an argument against Geologians, professing Christianity and admitting the inspiration of the Bible, yet cavilling at the recorded history of the Deluge, and attempting, by conclusions drawn from discoveries, which cannot be and have not been sufficiently tested, to cast a suspicion upon it, it is very important: since, whilst another part of this work (we omit what we conceive to be misapplications of legends) has shewn the memory of the event to have been preserved all over the world, and fully shewn it, this Christian Sacrament has made the event itself a type and a figure of the internal import of the ordinance by which it is administered, and an ethical direction to the newness of life which it enjoins. Hence, this Father calls baptism “*the water of life*, which alone can cleanse the penitent.” The erroneous inference which has been drawn from his question, what is the use of that baptism which only washes the body? has arisen from inattention to the context, in which he was not speaking of

Christian baptism, but merely of that symbolical washing which the Jews employed.

Irenæus, who lived near to the Apostles, says, that when our Lord committed to his Apostles the power of *discipulating* (if we may coin a term, μαθητεύσατε) and baptizing all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he endued them "*with the power of regenerating to God;*" in other places he also identifies regeneration* with baptism, and mentions infants most expressly among those who, being regenerated unto God, are saved BY JESUS CHRIST.

But Clemens Alexandrinus, whose extensive knowledge of Gentile theology, though he was a very fanciful writer, as all who have read his *Stromata* must grant, qualified him to see where a general principle of belief existed, unequivocally affirms, that the doctrine of regeneration by water was very antiently and extensively maintained. He notices the Hindu regeneration, the purification of the initiated into the mysteries by water, and supposes the ablutions practised, according to Homer, by Penelope and Telemachus, as preparatives to prayer, to have been an image of baptism derived from Moses.† Nevertheless, thus comparing profane with sacred things, he does not account baptism merely a commemorative sign of regeneration, but attributes the "effectual union of the Spirit and the water to the baptism of our Lord, whose regeneration in the waters of the Jordan was signified by the declaration from heaven: this day have I begotten thee. He was made perfect by the washing of baptism alone, and sanctified by the descent of the Holy Spirit." The Valentinian, Theodotus quoted by Clemens, whose opinions were not heretical about baptism, any more than those of the other Valentinians, identified regeneration with baptism, plainly asserting that baptism was the ordinary vehicle of regeneration. Under the image of the dove sent from the Ark, which announced to the earth that the wrath of heaven was pacified, Tertullian represents the dove of the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven down to our earth, that is to our flesh, emerging from the laver after our former state of sin, and bringing the peace of God. In another part of his work on baptism, Tertullian proclaims the blessedness of the baptized, *because the grace of God waited on them when they rose from that most sacred laver of their new birth-day.* Again, he desires, that it be not thought wonderful, that *water should give life*, since the nature of water being sanc-

* Adv. Hær. iii. 19. τοῦ βαπτισματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως. et alibi.

† Strom. iv. 22.

*tified by the Holy Spirit of God moving on it, received the power of sanctifying:—*all of which passages are superabundant in evidence, that Tertullian inseparably connected a life-giving grace with his idea of baptism. He indignantly expostulated against those who thought slightly of the ordinance; “because they considered it (*water*) too weak an instrument to effect so mighty a change as regeneration, or because they preferred some Abana or Pharphar of their own to the water, which our Lord himself appointed for cleansing the soul from sin.”

The stream of testimony is carried on in the third century by Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Martial, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Methodius. Hippolytus calls him who has been regenerated in the laver through water and the Holy Spirit, a coheir with Christ after the resurrection from the dead, and asks,

“How shall a man arrive at immortality? How? By water and the Holy Spirit. This is the water partaking of the Spirit, by which regenerated man is born unto life.”

Origen also illustrated baptism by the Deluge, and clearly considered all baptized persons to be in a regenerated state, which opinion not having been expressed in the way of controversy, it is inferible, that he was delivering the known sentiments of the Church. Commenting on St. Matthew's use of the term, xix. 28, he referred it to the resurrection, *i.e.* another birth into a new state of existence, in which there will be new heavens and new earth; and called the introduction into that regeneration the laver of regeneration, of which St. Paul wrote; and the introduction into that new state of existence the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which is consequent upon the laver of regeneration:

“By our natural birth (says he) every one is polluted; but by the regeneration of the laver every one is clean, having been born again of water and the Spirit, yet only clean, as seen through a glass, and darkly; but in that regeneration, when the Son of Man will sit upon his throne in glory, he will be quite clean, face to face having arrived at that regeneration *through the laver of regeneration.*”

He is also a standing witness of infantine baptism in the Church:—

“*Wherefore also infants are baptized; for unless a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*” (Homil. 14, in Luc. iii. 948.)

Cyprian too (Epist. p. 76.) held, that baptism, whether performed by infusion or sprinkling, was equally regular. In his time, infantine baptism had occasioned some disputes, not whether it was lawful or proper (for had such been the case, had

it been an innovation introduced after the apostolic age, some party or other would have animadverted upon it in the Church, and some ecclesiastical writer or other would have noticed it); but whether, according to the doctrine of Fidus, as it was the spiritual successor of circumcision, infants should be baptized before the eighth day. The question, as it was submitted to the African Fathers, at the third Council of Carthage, fully recognized infantine baptism, as a thing indisputable; the sole complaint having been, that some resorted to the ordinance within the second or third day after the birth. Sixty-six Bishops formed the council; and Cyprian, acting as their president and organ, stated the unanimous determination to have been, that the mercy and grace of God are not to be denied to any one, and that the grace given to the baptized cannot *be greater or less in proportion to the age of the recipients*, "because the Holy Spirit is not granted according to measure (the measure of our worthiness), but according to the affection and indulgence of a Father equally to all." Again: "if remission of sins is granted to the most heinous offenders, when they became believers, and baptism and grace is prohibited to none, *how much more should it not be prohibited to an infant*, who, being just born, has committed no sin, except that being born after the flesh, it has contracted the contagion of death from its first birth?"* The others likewise identify baptism and regeneration.

Mr. Harcourt next carries his inquiry into the fourth century; but in this the number of writers is so much increased, that the notices and extracts must be brief. Among these we find Eusebius speaking of the gift of the knowledge of the Trinity being granted by Jesus to us by that mystical regeneration, viz: the command to baptize all nations in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and elsewhere calling the baptism in the name of the Trinity the mystical regeneration of saving faith. In a controversy with no very scrupulous opponents, Athanasius avers, that the perfected† (a phrase which, in the Fathers, means the baptized) are made the children of God; and that by baptism we are made complete or perfect Christians.‡ Since, therefore, we cannot become the children of God, or complete Christians, without being born again of the Spirit, his meaning requires no dissertation to unfold it. Cyril

* Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacre*, iii. 75-76. On Infantine Baptism, see an article in *The Churchman* for September, 1838, at page 308. Painter, 342, Strand.

† Orat. Contra Arianos, v. i. p. 841.

‡ Dial. i. contra Macedoniam, v. ii. p. 266.

of Jerusalem also desired his Catechumens not to look to the washing (baptism) as if it consisted of mere water, but *to look to that spiritual grace which is given with the water*; rightly arguing, that as the offerings on heathen altars became polluted by the invocation of idols, *so by the invocation of the Trinity, mere water acquires a power of sanctification*. It is, moreover, clear from his general language, that he considered infants capable of receiving the ordinance.

Baptism and regeneration, in fact, gradually became so nearly equivalent in import, that the Fathers of this century accounted it indifferent which of the terms they selected for the former. Basil the Great, commenting on that passage in the 28th Psalm, which represents God inhabiting the water-flood, denominates baptism the habitation of the Lord prepared in the souls of those who are sanctified, and says, that God inhabits the soul that is washed from sin. Elsewhere he pronounces us saved *by being regenerated through the grace received in baptism*; and argues, that if baptism was the *beginning of his life*, and the first of his days, viz. *that day of regeneration*, it is plain that the sound pronounced *in the gracious act of adoption*—videlicet, *the baptismal formula*—ought to be exceeding honoured by him. When he styled baptism deliverance to the captives, *the remission of debt, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, a glorious robe, a seal that cannot be broken, a passport to heaven, an earnest of the kingdom, the grace of adoption*, could he have been more explicit?

Pacianus makes the *unregenerated* equivalent to the *unbaptized*; and he urges against those who denied that there was room for repentance after baptism, St. Peter's repentance, "who had been baptized by Jesus, when he washed his feet, and said, he that is once washed needeth not to be washed again. So that he was in a state of sanctification before he fell, and before he received from Christ the remedy of repentance." Gregory, son of the Bishop of Nazianzum, and himself at one time Bishop of Constantinople, also argues, that as our nature consists of two parts, the soul and the body—the one visible, the other invisible, so baptism is double, viz. by the water and by the Spirit: the one received visibly and corporeally, the other concurring with it invisibly and incorporeally. With respect to infantine baptism, though on one occasion he advised it to be postponed until the third year, that the infants might hear and answer, at another he inveighed against the impropriety of a delay, saying, "*hast thou an infant?*" "Let not wickedness gain an opportunity against it. *Let it be sanctified from a BABE: let it be hallowed by the Spirit from its TENDEREST INFANCY!*"

Gregory Nyssene calls baptism *a life-giving power*, by which our nature is transformed from a corruptible to an incorruptible existence: which he explains by the accession of the Spirit, which comes mysteriously for our freedom. He more explicitly states elsewhere, that we are born again in baptism; that baptism is not only the purification of sins and the remission of offences, but the cause or source of renovation and regeneration. Chrysostom believed baptismal grace to have a prospective as well as a retrospective efficacy: and in his homily (c. 4 ad Galatas viii. p. 748), he places his sentiments beyond doubt, or the equivocation of those who may quote him:

“In our regeneration the words of God, known to the faithful, and pronounced by the Priest, mould and regenerate the person baptised.”

He adds,

“Since baptism is said to be a symbol of death and resurrection, it is therefore called regeneration; for as he who rises again after death seems to be born again, so he who is regenerated in baptism, having first died in the water, and then being again raised to life, by the power of the Spirit, is said to be born again.”

Chromatius supports the doctrine: he propounds that our Saviour received the washing of regeneration, that we might be born again to a new life; that to the regenerated in baptism the kingdom of heaven is opened; that history revealed the order of our salvation, and showed that by the saving power of water-baptism we were made the sons of God and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Mark, the hermit, who is said to have learned the whole Bible by heart, declares that Jerusalem, which is above, by which he meant the Christian Church, regenerates us with the water of regeneration: and he was manifestly an advocate for infantine baptism. It was pointedly inquired by him, *“who can dare to deny the fact of his receiving the grace of the Holy Spirit from baptism?”*

Jerome also asserts the conditional nature of the Grace of Baptism: he exhorts, that we flatter not ourselves that as it remits our former sins, so it will keep us from sins for the future, *unless* those who are baptized *keep their heart with all diligence*: here, as likewise in his exposition of Ezekiel's vision of the waters running out of the temple, he delineates, very clearly, “the opinion of the Church, that baptism conveys the first streams of divine grace to the soul, washing it from its original pollution, and saving it from the first effects of the devil's malice.” His words, *there is no baptism of the Church without the Holy Ghost;—Baptism makes the new man: the old Adam altogether, dies in the laver, and the new man is raised up with CHRIST in*

Baptism, fully shew his sentiments on the subject; and his commentary on Isaiah ix. (iii. 401), proves him to have been in favour of the administration of the ordinance to infants.

Moreover, Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, whom “Mr. Faber has invincibly demonstrated” to have been the father of modern Calvinism, is a most strenuous assertor of baptismal regeneration. On the baptism of infants he is very diffuse;* and one passage, which has a great analogy to our own service, is well worthy of quotation—

“Be most firmly assured, and have no manner of doubt, that to infants who cannot believe by their own will, or repent of their original sin, the sacrament of Faith, which is Holy Baptism, suffices for their salvation, as long as they continue of an age incapable of reasoning.† Speaking of one, he affirms, you might say that *he is re-born*; you might say that *he is regenerated*; or lastly, you might say that *he is baptized*.‡ For the Latin custom has so borrowed this term from the Greek, that it is never understood to mean any thing but the Sacrament of Regeneration.

This subject Mr. Harcourt may be fairly said to have set at rest; for it is impossible for any one of contrary opinions to overthrow the evidences which he has collected. Feeling the strength of these evidences, he rightly urges, that the four first centuries of Christianity are better interpreters of the sense of a controverted term used by the Apostles, than Zuingli or Calvin, who lived more than a thousand years after them. This continuous stream of unanimous testimony from the Apostolic age downwards sweeps every objection before it. We account it needless to prove from the Liturgy, and the writers of our own Church, that our doctrine is precisely the same as that of the primitive Church; because to those who know how the Liturgy is expressed, and what these writers have published on the subject, the result of the preceding inquiry must have made the fact most apparent. In this part of his book, Mr. Harcourt is unassailable, excepting, perhaps, when he reverts to Mythology; and he has performed a service to Christianity for which he deserves well of the orthodox, and we hope also of heretics, since his arguments and proofs from the Fathers are adapted to lead them from their error into the true doctrine.

* Cf. Ennarratio in Psalmum 50, v. viii. p. 106. Enchiridion ad Laurentium l. i. c. 52, v. iii. p. 39.

† De fide ad Petrum Diaconum l. i. c. 30.

‡ Contra Julianum Pelagianum l. vi. c. 4. Respecting infants, also consult Sententiæ decerptæ, vol. iii. 240. De peccatorum meritis et remissione contra Pelagianum l. i. c. 38. vol. vii. 148.

To sum up the whole, Mr. Harcourt's learning and deep reading cannot be denied; and if he had not attached himself to a particular system, both would have rendered his book a complete treasure. But we do not perceive how he has overthrown the chief objections of modern Geologists; nor do we see how this part of his title has been verified in his work. The mass of legends which he has collected, can, at the utmost, only prove the universality of the Deluge; but cannot, in any way, approach the arguments which have been drawn from fancied and "spade-deep" discoveries, against particulars recorded of the Cosmogony and of the Deluge. Something more than the Mythological—something more than the Etymological—will be required for that purpose. Nor do we observe that any provision has been made against the allegation, that these universal notices of the event may, by colonists, have been transmitted from place to place. Viewing these volumes in this light, we cannot detect any close bearing in them on Geological points.

We ourselves believe, that memorials of the Deluge are scattered all over the earth; that the traditions of all nations contain a reference to that event; that allusions to it existed in the mysteries: but we do not believe that every tradition of every nation had such a relation, any more than we believe that every doctrine in the mysteries was so confined. From several works that have been written in this style on the subject, it would seem, that every Pagan idea of a Supreme Being was reducible to Noah, as a personage, and that every triad in every religious system exclusively pointed to his three sons. This we account an utter impossibility. There also appears to us to have been a great confusion between the Ark of Noah (תֵּבָה), and the Ark of the Covenant, (אֲרֹן): for, even if the latter had been designed to have had a commemorative reference to the former, they were, in fact, exceedingly distinct; and of the latter, many of the Pagan ceremonies, which have been attributed to the former, were, plainly, most corrupt imitations.

In many of the points also, which seem to present the most striking analogies, no real historic data exist to prove that there existed any analogy at all: hence an uncertain and a most faulty Etymology, collecting words from all quarters of the globe without regard to any inherent connection which might have been in them, has been pressed into the service. For example, though the Latin *Arca*, doubtless, came from the Sanscrit *Arg'ha*, it will not follow because the Latin word has been applied to the *ARK*, as a certainty, that the Sanscrit word had any relation to it; though we have little hesitation in affirming, that the ap-

plication of the Sanscrit term to a *boat-shaped* vessel, used in performing *libations*, would be accounted conclusive evidence by the favourers of this system. But ere any historic conclusion had been drawn, the *absolute* certainty of a philological connection between *Arg'ha* and the Ark, should have been demonstrated, and in defect of power to demonstrate it, the casual coincidence of sound should not have been brought into the argument, which coincidence, at best, is only between it and the Latin, not between it and the Hebrew, nor even the Greek. Were we to investigate all the instances of the same nature, much of the theory would be demolished; and were we to examine those which have a far less appearance of probability, the evidences which have been produced could be comprised in a far smaller compass.

In a Theological view, these volumes are very valuable: they prove the universal tradition of the Deluge, and very rightly represent it as a type of the Christian Sacrament of Baptism. The development of the doctrine of regeneration is one of the most able, sound, and splendid performances, that we have seen: it is sufficient to induce every one to be eager to possess the work. As we write honestly, and without partiality, whilst we have pointed out the parts which we conceive to be erroneous, we have felt a pleasure in drawing the attention of our readers to the meritorious portions with which these parts are intermixed; and in even justice to Mr. Harcourt, we have analyzed his researches into the primitive ideas on Baptism and Regeneration, and made copious extracts from them, that our readers may form a judgment of their own. With its faults, the work is a laborious and learned undertaking; but the merits preponderate over the etymological faults: and if Mr. Harcourt, bidding adieu to the *Arkites* and *Helio-Arkites*, will devote his abilities to critical elucidations of the Scriptures and of Scriptural Antiquities and History, few will be found having the ability to contend with him for superiority of talent.

But if it be deemed necessary to compare the biblical account of the Deluge with the mythological accounts of all nations, why cannot the facts with their historical vouchers be produced without the encumbrance of matter, which, if refuted, will become a hindrance?—Why cannot the legends be brought together, not as *certainties*, but as *probabilities*? These, discussed according to their respective value, would be useful in the highest degree; but when they are rendered ridiculous by appendages, which are inadmissible, it is to be feared, that the real value, concealed under the superincumbent lumber, will not carefully be sought.

ART. II.—*A History of Popery ; containing an account of the Origin, Growth, and Progress of the Papal Power ; its political influence in the European States-system, and its effects on the Progress of Civilization. To which are added, an Examination of the Present State of the Romish Church in Ireland ; a Brief History of the Inquisition ; and Specimens of Monkish Legends.* 8vo. pp. 452—Parker.

WITHOUT in the slightest degree identifying ourselves with all the opinions and sentiments to which the author has given publicity in the work we have selected to head this Article, on the subject of the ecclesiastical organization of the Church of Rome, and the influence she has exerted over Christendom, we cannot but express our conviction that the work is one of considerable importance—a desideratum, the want of which has long been felt by the literary and religious world, and, from the popular style of its composition and arrangement, one that is calculated to grow gradually into a standard epitome of the political history of Popery. There is here and there, it is true, a dash of morbid liberalism scattered through its pages, and a few indications of laxity of Church of England principles in the writer, which detract somewhat from the pleasure we should otherwise feel in giving it a rather extended notice. But, as a whole, it is an able and useful volume, and with the above short condemnatory remark, and its naturally attendant warning, we recommend it to the perusal of our readers.

We have frequently been struck with the very little attention that appears to have been paid to Popery, as a *Political System*, by the great mass of Protestant writers, as well as by the public generally ; and the consequent apathetic and criminal negligence that exists with regard to the necessity for a political as well as religious opposition to its encroachments. Indeed, if the true character of Popery, as a political as well as religious system, was duly considered by the public, they would soon see the inconsistency of permitting the members of the Church of Rome to exercise any political power in Protestant England ; and with the irresistible impulse occasioned by the conviction that national independence and greatness, and individual security and happiness, demanded their expulsion from the British Legislature, would petition that the vassals of the Roman Pontiff might be banished, and that for ever, from the councils of the empire. Let us not hear the ridiculous and oft-exploded dogma reiterated, that politics and religion are distinct and separate ; in this question, at least, they are inseparably interwoven. As without religion there can be no true morality, equally without religion

can there be no true politics. The Bible was intended to supply instruction to man as much in his legislative as in his more private character. It was ordained to be his counsellor and guide in the discharge of every duty, whether to his king, his family, his country, or his God. Its laws are as binding upon rulers and governors in Church and State, as upon the heads of congregational or domestic circles. Public functionaries are as much amenable to the behests of the Omnipotent as private individuals. And whatever the mushroom wisdom of this superficial age may venture to assert to the contrary, religion is indissolubly connected with politics; and politics without religion would be a species of carcase without animation, a fabric without foundation, an arch without its key-stone, and a planetary system without its centre of gravitation and laws of attraction. The infidel illumination of the nineteenth century may flash her unsubstantiated rays across our path, and deny the stability of the principles of eternal rectitude and truth which are to be found in the revelation of the Almighty; but we will still retain our solemn impressions, still maintain the supreme and unerring authority of the Bible, in opposition to that and every other notion that is "earthly, sensual, and devilish." If we may make use of an every day illustration, the jejune and effeminate illuminati of the present age have forsaken the pure and steady light of heaven, which pours its useful and refreshing influence upon every object, and reveals the substantial qualities, proportions, and relations of things, to bask in the lurid and distracting, fitful and confounding glare of hell, which rolls its black and delusive clouds of sulphurous smoke around the path of its unhappy victim, hiding the face of heaven, and dazzling and distorting the mental vision, till the yawning gulph of perdition opens to receive him! The man who looks upon Popery as a harmless and pleasing object, is as much the subject of the deceitful craft and subtlety of the devil (whose master-piece Popery certainly is), as he is the soft and pitiable fool who displays, in painful ignorance and imbecility, his forgetfulness of history, and his unacquaintedness with the very alphabet of Popery. The mere politician, who pays no regard to the repeated and multiplied aggressions of Popery, and only exclaims, in listless indifference, when he hears of its advances, or sees its progressive march, "Oh, I have nothing to do with theology!" is either an egregious simpleton, an empty conceit, or a thorough-paced and determined traitor. Popery, as the history sketched by the author before us amply testifies, in her entire ecclesiastical structure is eminently political: her assumption of supreme power and authority, and the unavoidable and uniform fruits

produced by so arrogant and haughty a position, entertained in political equally with religious matters of jurisprudence, give an abundant and undeviating testimony to the accuracy of the solemn truth, that national security and independence are incompatible with the exercise and enjoyment of political power by Papists in a Protestant country. We are quite ready to prove to those who look simply at secondary causes, and the working of natural principles, that what is wrong in Christian principle, must be dangerous in political practice; that what is wrong on religious grounds, must be so, even on the lower ground of political expediency. As there are many who doubt the veracity of this most important statement, we will just exhibit its correctness with respect to the granting political power to Popery; a deed which was never sought to be justified (as its advocates knew well it could not be), on religious principles, but purely on the dictates and requirements of political expediency.

We will begin with enumerating a principle, which no one, we think, possessed of common sense, or conversant with the rudiments of national law and government, can for a moment question or deny:—“*That to entrust with political power, and especially with any legislative authority, the subjects and vassals of a foreign and hostile potentate, is irreconcilably at variance and thoroughly incompatible with national security and independence.*” Now, it is an easy thing to prove that Papists are the vassals of an hostile potentate; and, being such, it inevitably follows, if our above-stated axiom be correct, that it is diametrically opposed to the fundamental principles of national policy, right, and justice, to consign to them political power or authority in this Protestant country. There are three things which incontrovertibly prove the vassalage and abject subjection of Papists to a foreign power: first, the oath taken by every Roman Catholic Bishop; secondly, the oath taken by every Roman Catholic Priest; and thirdly, the condition of the laity and their thorough subjection to their priests. The oath taken by the Romish Bishops is as follows:

“I will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N. Pope N. and to his successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing that they may lose life or member; or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust me withal by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice—I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of St.

Peter, saving my order, against all men. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church of our Lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance."*

This, as our readers must be aware, is nothing more or less than an *oath of feudal fealty*. It binds the men who take it, hand and foot, body and soul, to a foreign potentate, and permits them to be the subjects of a Protestant sovereign; just so far only as he is pleased to permit.

The oath taken by every Roman Catholic priest, which is generally called the Creed of Pope Pius, contains the following clauses:—

"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome as the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ; and all things defined, delivered, and declared by the holy canons and general councils, and especially by the Council of Trent, I do unhesitatingly receive and confess; and likewise I condemn and reject all things contrary thereto. This is the true faith out of which there is no salvation: I will keep it firmly to my life's end, *and will take care that it be kept by my subjects, and those of whom I may have charge.*"

In this oath, the Popish priest not only promises unlimited obedience to the Pope (as the Vicar of Christ), but likewise pledges himself *to enforce obedience* from those of whom he may have the spiritual charge. The celibacy of the Popish priesthood too, effectually severs the dear and hallowed ties which bind a man to his country, and render him a patriot for present and for future generations. He has no earthly cares or concerns but to maintain and advance the interests of his Church; no domestic sympathies or family endearments to interfere with his entire subjection to Rome. The epistle of Pope Benedict XIV. to Nicolas Lercari, proves that the priests are not considered by the Church of Rome to be the subjects of the state in which they live, in which this important principle is evidently expressed as a matter understood to be recognised by all.

With regard to the condition of the laity, it is only necessary that we give a brief analysis of the scheme of papal dominion: 1. The Pope claims to be the supreme feudal lord, wherever he has a hierarchy of Bishops or Vicars Apostolic. 2. All

* It is perhaps unnecessary to inform our readers that by the "Royal-
ties of St. Peter," the Popes understand their claims to particular
countries as feudal lords paramount. Baronius labours to prove that
every country in Europe is a province of these Royalties.

Bishops and Vicars Apostolic are feudal barons under him; they derive *titles of temporal dignity* directly from the Court of Rome, and are peers of the creation of the *sovereign* Pontiff. 3. The priesthood of a diocese, and the youth intended for holy orders, are called *subjects* of the Bishop. 4. The tenants of a see are called *vassals* of the Bishop, although the see lands may have been alienated by the civil power. 5. Heretics, schismatics, and all others who may reject the papal authority, are called "rebels to our lord the Pope."

"The Church retains its right over heretics and schismatics, as a general retains the right of punishing deserters, although their names may not be on the muster-roll of his army." "By one of the Trent canons, every member of the Church of Rome is bound to believe that all baptized persons are liable to be compelled, by *punishment*, to be Christians; or, what is the same in the Roman Catholic divinity, spiritual subjects of the Pope."

The Pope indeed claims no temporal power, but he claims supreme power over all temporal things: and this is no mere nominal power, for in every reign, from Elizabeth to George III., he interfered to prevent the Roman Catholic laity from taking an oath of allegiance to the King of Great Britain; and it appears, that even now, without an indulgence from the Pope, they dare not take such an oath.

The Roman Catholic laity, therefore, are not free agents, but are compelled, under pain of excommunication, which they are taught to consider as synonymous with eternal damnation, to render a blind obedience to their priests, whom we have proved to be the sworn vassals of the Pope. The first principle of a free constitution requires that every voter should be free to give his vote as he pleases; but this the papist cannot do, he must give it as his priest directs. In reality, the whole Roman Catholic laity are in an abject and debased state of subjection to their priests, who exercise a spiritual despotism over them, to which no parallel can be found in history. Is it right, then, that the privileges and liberties of British Protestants should be trampled in the dust by the slaves of popish priests and the cringing vassals of the Court of Rome?

The political history of Popery is succinctly and clearly sketched in the present volume, and the entire historic narrative from its origin to the present moment, exhibits, in the most forcible and impressive manner, the fact, that the powerful influence wielded by the Church of Rome for so many centuries is to be attributed to her being far more a system of policy, adapting herself to the peculiar circumstances of every age and country, moulding her organization with every change in popu-

lar institutions, and framing her vast and complicated machinery so as to substantiate and carry into effect the claims of her Popes to spiritual and temporal supremacy, than to her being an institution for the propagation of any particular theological opinions. We shall not follow the author through his historical chapters, but content ourselves with stating, that he appears to have drawn his materials from the most authentic sources, and contrived to give an air of popularity and considerable interest to many periods of history, which too frequently furnish but few attractions to the general reader. The chapter to which we would most pointedly direct the attention of our readers is one on the "Condition of the Romish Church in Ireland." For, as the political influence of Popery has always been most disastrously employed for the country in which she has contrived to establish her supremacy, we look upon every symptom of political resuscitation, and every fresh concession made to her political claims in this country, with the greatest concern and alarm. The alliance between popery and democracy, and the turbulent interference of the Romish priests at elections, are dismal tokens for the prosperity of the sister island. The wanton encouragement given to popery of late years by the British Government is a very painful and bitter source of anxiety to the true patriot. Let us briefly enumerate a few of the recent national acts of prodigal maintenance and patronage of Popery. In 1829 that most disastrous and criminal of all Anti-Protestant measures was passed, the so-called Roman Catholic Relief Bill. That fatal act certainly greatly impaired, if it did not entirely destroy, the Protestant character of the British Constitution; and ever since the period when the nation formed this unhappy alliance with an idolatrous and apostate church, the divine blessing has evidently been withdrawn from the land, the councils of the empire have been paralysed, and our revered institutions, both in Church and State, have been shaken to their very base.

In 1831, Government support was withdrawn from a society in which the Scriptures were made the basis of education, and transferred to a new Board of National Education, which has mutilated the Word of God, and practically gives the control over public instruction to the Roman Catholic priests! In the room of the inspired Volume, the conductors of these schools have substituted a compilation of extracts, not unfrequently taken from the Romish version, and accompanied with notes, which often palliate, if they do not actually defend, the errors of the Church of Rome. For the maintenance of this unhallowed system, a vote of 40,000*l.* and upwards has been annually made by the House of Commons. In the year 1833, chiefly through

Popish influence, ten Protestant Bishoprics in Ireland were suppressed; and in 1835 an attempt was made not only to annihilate the Protestant Establishment in a large number of parishes in that country, by depriving them of resident Clergy, but also to alienate part of the revenues of the Church by the notorious appropriation clause. Through the divine blessing, these attempts were defeated by the firmness of the House of Lords.

It is likewise calculated that nearly half a million of the public money has been expended upon the College of Maynooth, an institution which teaches systematically principles of disaffection, immorality, and false religion, and annually sends forth a class of men who have made themselves notorious as political agitators and the chief disturbers of the peace and tranquillity of the country. On the subject of Maynooth, the author before us has the following graphic and judicious remarks:

“A great change has been wrought in the character of the Irish priesthood, since the establishment of the Romish College at Maynooth; one of the most dangerous institutions ever sanctioned by a government. Previous to the French Revolution, the Irish Romanists were obliged to seek for education on the continent; travelling, and the habits of mixing with foreign society, removed many of their superstitions, softened their manners, and abated those prejudices against English rule, which were fostered by local traditions.

“Many persons now alive can remember the time when the Romish priest was a welcome guest at the Protestant table—when he was the friend of the landlord as well as the tenant—and when experience of foreign despotism taught him to value the blessings of British institutions. But the state of the continent, towards the close of the last century, induced the British minister to devise a plan for the domestic education of the Irish priesthood, and, in an evil hour, he adopted Dr. Hussey’s plan for the establishment of Maynooth. The actual effect of the education at Maynooth will be best understood by the following sketch of the ordinary history of an Irish priest:—

“Candidates for the priesthood are usually found in the lower grade of the middle class; they are the sons of petty shopkeepers, and humble farmers. When a boy of such a family displays any aptitude for learning, he is at once placed in a new situation, and marked out from his brothers and sisters, as one destined for the sacred orders. The reverence shown him by his companions exalts his spiritual pride and rivets every prejudice firmly in his mind. Protestants of the same rank refuse to join in the homage paid to the young aspirant, and hence his self-opinion is wounded, so that from the very starting-post, he acquires a dislike of them and their religion.

“His education is rigidly exclusive; he learns a little Latin and a great deal of bigotry; he must submit implicitly to the dictates of the order to which he will hereafter belong—for recommendations to Maynooth can only be obtained by a tried submission and attachment to the ordinances and observances of the Romish Church. By the time that

the young aspirant has completed his preparatory course, he has been trained to regard the priesthood as the highest dignity attainable by human ambition, and he has learned that his future interests will be best promoted by maintaining and propagating such an opinion.

“At Maynooth he is subjected to a system of monastic discipline which it is scarcely credible could exist in the nineteenth century. The students are not allowed to converse, meet together, or enjoy any relaxation, without the permission of a superior, which is rarely asked, and still more rarely accorded; lectures are read to them during their meals, and they are compelled to give proof of attention to them; no books or papers are allowed to be read that have not previously been sanctioned by the collegiate authorities; dress, diet, and even sleep, are subject to minute regulations, which are all strictly enforced. The course of study in classics and science is very mean, and there is good reason to believe that in this department omission is not only tolerated but encouraged. Dogmatic theology is the main object of study, and the chief intellectual discipline is to brandish the weapons of scholastic logic. Such is the mechanical drill to which the spiritual militia of the Romish Church in Ireland is subjected, and it must be confessed that human ingenuity could scarcely have devised better means for making it effective.

“The priest quits college with all the prejudices of his youth strengthened, and darkened besides by the superstitious gloom which such a course of education necessarily produces. He is sent to take charge of a flock at a distance from his native place, in order that the remembered meanness of his origin should not weaken his sacerdotal authority, and he enters on his charge with a hatred of Protestantism which every circumstance of his life tends to increase. Ignorance of the usages of polite society excludes him from mixing with the higher ranks, and pride limits his intercourse with the inferior classes. To exalt his order necessarily becomes the chief object of his ambition; his whole energies are directed to acquire spiritual sway and political power.”* †

* Whilst on the subject of Maynooth we cannot refrain from quoting an author who is not very likely to give too stern a description of its abominations. The Hon. and Rev. Baptiste Noel, in his *Notes of a Short Tour*, &c. 1836, says,

“As I departed from the college, grateful for the polite attention of Dr. Montague, I could not but reflect with melancholy interest on the prodigious moral power lodged within the walls of that mean, rough-cast, white-washed range of buildings, standing without one architectural recommendation on that dark and gloomy flat. What a vomiting of fiery zeal for worthless ceremonies and fatal errors! Thence how the priestly deluge, issuing like an infant sea, or, rather, like a fiery flood, from its roaring crater, pours over the parishes of Ireland to repress all spiritual improvement by their anti-Protestant enmities and their cumbrous rites!

“For those poor youths themselves, many of them with ingenuous countenances, I felt a deeper pity still. There, before they know it, to be drilled and practised for their hopeless warfare against the king-

But it is not merely in the British Isles that our present Anti-Protestant Government exhibit the proofs of the Popish tenure by which they hold their places. We might, with ease, enumerate the most glaring acts of official encouragement to Popery, perpetrated at the very time that the Protestant Church is depressed and weakened in almost every dependency of Great Britain.† Such paragraphs as the following are daily appearing in the public press, and one-quarter of these reprehensible proceedings do not find their way to the public—

“*Ministerial Patronage of Popery.*—At the Cape of Good Hope there is a Popish Bishop, to whom is assigned one of the military barracks, till Government shall have built a palace for his Lordship.”

We have a work before us of considerable information with respect to the increasingly important colony of New South Wales,§ from which we shall here give one or two extracts.—

“The Roman Catholics possess one large and handsome Church in Sydney not yet completed : in aid of its construction, donations, amounting in all, to 1,200*l.*, have been, at different times, granted by this Government.”

One thousand two hundred pounds granted by the local government of a dependency of Protestant Britain, towards the erection of *one* Popish mass-house ! Well may there be an

dom of Christ—there to imbibe endless prejudices, fatal to themselves and others—there to be sworn upon the altars of superstition to an interminable hatred of what they call heresy, which is indeed pure and undefiled religion ; to have prejudice blackened into malice against those who love God ; to have all their worldly interests thenceforth identified with priest-craft ; to settle down, perhaps, after a fearful struggle between interest and conscience, into Epicurean scepticism ; perhaps, in some instances, to teach the people to adore what they know to be a bit of bread ; to curse them from the altar, for what they themselves believe to be right and a duty—the perusal of the Word of God ; and, lastly, to despise them for trembling at the impotent malediction.”

† We are glad to see the iniquitous annual grant to this college occupy public attention to the extent it does. Last session forty-one petitions were presented against it, and we believe from what we hear of the matter that the number will be vastly increased next session.

‡ We beg to refer our readers to a valuable tract, entitled *The Progress of Popery in the British Dominions and elsewhere*, published by the Protestant Association.

§ *New South Wales*, its present state and future prospects ; being a statement, with documentary evidence, submitted in support of *Petitions* to His Majesty and Parliament. 8vo. pp. 644. 1837.

alarming increase of crime and misery in that extensively progressing colony, when its domestic Legislature exhibits so much readiness and liberality in endowing the Church of Rome, and contributing towards the building of Popish chapels, from which will be poured forth, as from volcanic craters, a deluge of demoralizing and desolating lava.

“By the estimate for Church Establishments, for the year 1837, it appears, that there are at present one Bishop and eighteen Chaplains of the Church of England, and that six additional Chaplains are expected from England in the course of the year; that there are also eight Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland; and seven of the Roman Catholic Church, including the Bishop and Vicar-General;* six additional Clergymen of this persuasion also being expected to arrive in the Colony in the course of the year. The estimated charges of each establishment are as follows:—

Church of England.....	£14,827	10	0
Presbyterian Clergy	1,300	0	0
Roman Catholic Clergy	3,040	0	0

The compilers of this work have told us that the Roman Catholics do not form one-fourth part of the population; and yet, while they have seven Clergy, and the Church of England, comprising nearly three-fourths of the population, have nineteen, seven additional Popish Priests are sent out, and their passage paid by the Government, just because Dr. Polding, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Australia, informs them “that six additional Catholic Chaplains are required to render the Catholic a permanently resident and efficient Clergy—besides one to be stationed at Norfolk Island.” When will Lord Glenelg and the Colonial Government ever exhibit so much alacrity and precision in attending to the suggestions and requisitions of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England?

We find from this extract, that Popery receives an ecclesiastical endowment of at least three thousand a year, exclusive of continual donations, of the nature and extent of which we may give a tolerably good guess from the specimen recorded above, from its own Government: and we may add to this, that there are numerous schoolmasters of the Romish persuasion, paid by Government, throughout the length and breadth of the Colony. We may, likewise, just allude to a fact, illustrative of the favouritism shown towards Popery by the Noble Lord who is at present Secretary of State for the Colonies. It is customary to

* Though the compilers of this work mention only six, yet we happen to know, from Parliamentary papers in our possession, that *seven* Popish Priests were actually sent out to Australia, by the Government, in the year 1837.

allow Clergymen of the Church of England, who have received Government appointments in Australia, the sum of 150*l.*, for the purpose of defraying their passage out, provided they be *single*; and 200*l.*, in the event of their being *married*. The Popish Priests who were sent out in 1837, received, each of them, *the larger sum* from the treasury; so that, in fact, an addition of five-and-twenty per cent. was made by Lord Glenelg in their favour!

In speaking of Sydney, the Popish Dr. Spalding says, in his letter to Sir Richard Bourke—

“Since the month of October (1835), each Sunday, Ecclesiastical students have read prayers and instructions selected by the (Romish) Bishop, to the prisoners in the Carter’s Barracks, at the tread-mill, in the gaol, and recently to those employed at the new gaol.”

Every encouragement, in truth, is given to Popery: she is permitted to increase and proselytize, to poison the entire current of society, and revel as she pleases in the enjoyment of her despotic sway over the minds and bodies of her deluded votaries.

We will now bid adieu to the Author whose work heads this Article, and devote the remainder of it to the consideration of a work which we highly recommended to the notice of our readers in our last number; but which we feel, upon a more careful perusal than we were then able to give it, to be of too much importance to be hastily passed over. It is a small volume, which may almost be described as a continuation of the *History of Popery*, carrying us through the political history of Popery from the first dawn of the Reformation to the fatal measure of 1829. It is not so much a profound view of the changes which have taken place in the relative positions of the Papal and Reformed Churches, and analysis of the secret springs and hidden currents that have produced those changes, as a clear and practical development of the subtle workings of Popery, and continuous delineations of the distortions and colossal heavings of the hydra-headed monster.

We allude to the *State of Popery and Jesuitism in England*, by the Rev. Thomas Lathbury; and, as our former remarks tended to show that the chief dangers to be apprehended from the Church of Rome were from her political character and influence, so, in our future, we will endeavour to point out the measures most loudly called for, and most likely to be successful, in opposing her encroachments.

And, indeed, at a time when Popery is advancing her monstrous claims with unprecedented boldness, and taking rapid and alarming strides towards the attainment of her long-lost supre-

macy within these realms, we cannot do otherwise than hail with peculiar satisfaction, any indication of the revival of that pure Protestant feeling which we are persuaded has existed in the English breast ever since the Reformation, and still exists, though it may be in a latent and suppressed degree, notwithstanding the lamentable apathy, insufferable indolence, and unjustifiable neglect, which have obtained to so melancholy an extent of late years; we are rejoiced, we say, at the appearance of any symptom of the return of health and elasticity in the Protestantism of the country; and among other evidences of the resuscitation of its former vigour, we know none so exhilarating, or so truly cheering to the religious mind, as the increased activity and zeal of the Clergy of the Church of England in the discharge of their important duties as the spiritual watchmen of our Zion, and the cheerful alacrity and eagerness with which they have thrown themselves forward in the contest with the resuscitated powers of the Church of Rome, at the present ominous and most important juncture.

Mr. Lathbury is not altogether unknown to the public as an undaunted champion of the Church of England, and an able and indefatigable antagonist of the Church of Rome. His erudite and valuable History of the English Episcopacy, drew down upon its writer not only the anathemas of the Vatican, but the less innocuous thunders and vituperations of the great organ of all that is creedless in religion, democratic in politics, and unsettled in morality, the *Edinburgh Review*. Mr. Lathbury is well able to refute the baseless charges and envenomed assertions contained in that *Review*; and as he promises as much in the preface to his present volume, it would be equally an anticipation of what he might with most propriety advance, and a digression irrelevant to the subject matter of our critique, to enter upon any further discussion of the subject.

Mr. Lathbury's volume is an attempt, and a successful one, to trace the state of Popery in England, from its first overthrow, in the time of Henry VIII. to the passing of the so called Emancipation Bill; dwelling at most length upon those periods of our history, when this relentless foe to the human race rallied her forces, and endeavoured to re-establish herself again as the religion of Great Britain: pointing out, with faithfulness and considerable accuracy, the manner in which her advances were checked and her attacks repelled, and detailing the various weapons with which our forefathers successfully maintained the contest with the man of sin; under the expectation and prayer that we may be encouraged, from their example, to hope that similar success will attend our exertions in drawing our materials

of warfare from the same armoury, and adopting the same un-deviating line of conduct :

“As a man,” says Mr. Lathbury, “ who is involved in difficulties, of whatever kind, is delighted with meeting an individual who has been extricated from similar trials to those which now surround his own path, because he hopes to be made acquainted with the means by which his friend was delivered ; so we, in the present times of peril, may gather experience from the past history of our country ; we may consult its records, with the assurance of discovering the means to which our fathers resorted in their distress, and which were so abundantly blessed.”

Perceiving, with much pain and alarm, as every pious mind necessarily must, the zeal and activity of the Papists, in propagating their errors and endeavouring to make proselytes to their Church, and the apathy and indifference of modern (nominally Protestant) Dissenters, as well as their culpable proceedings in connecting and identifying themselves with Papists, for political purposes, Mr. Lathbury was anxious to render some assistance to the cause of truth, and has accordingly favoured the religious world with his present interesting volume, in order to expose the principles and practices of the Papists, to warn Dissenters of their inconsistency and criminality in leaguings with the avowed enemies of “ pure and undefiled religion,” and pointing out to the truly Protestant reader the means most likely to prove efficacious and be attended with the divine blessing in combating the efforts of Popery to enchain the British people again in the galling fetters of her rank and poisonous superstitions. But as every desert has its Oasis, so are there some Dissenters of whom we may write better things :

“ Of course (says Mr. Lathbury) all the Dissenters are not included in my censures. My remarks apply only to that portion of the Dissenting community who act in agreement with the Papists. There are many Dissenters, some of whom I could mention, who, so far from approving of the measures so eagerly pursued by their brethren, do not hesitate to condemn them in the most decided terms. These are the true representatives of the principles of the Dissenters of the last century. They are the successors of such men as Watts and Doddridge, and Henry, and others of a kindred spirit ; men who would be horror-struck at the unseemly unions which often are witnessed, on political questions, between the Papists and the Dissenters of the nineteenth century.”

All we can wish, which we do from our very heart's-core, is, that the whole body of modern Dissenters may be inoculated, and become thoroughly saturated with the principles which would lead them to behold their anomalous connexion with the beast of Rome, with the same horror and dismay that would have filled

the hearts of Watts or Doddridge at so melancholy and hateful a sight.

To speak in laudatory terms of the work before us is an easy and a pleasing task, but we wish rather to bring before our readers something that may be practically beneficial with regard to the duties rendered binding upon every Christian by the rapid and progressive encroachments of Popery, than to give them an eulogistic commentary upon Mr. Lathbury's work, or a synopsis of any treatise upon the various phases of Popery since the Reformation.

That Popery has exerted herself, and that unremittingly and with unwearied assiduity, to regain her pre-eminence and again lord it over God's heritage in this country, we think no one who is conversant in the slightest degree with England's history can for one moment doubt. Whether we contemplate the attempts of the foreign enemies and disaffected subjects of Elizabeth—the plots and treasons which ensued upon her accession to the throne—the multifarious efforts of the Jesuits to divide and sow the seeds of discord among Protestants—their assumption of every character in society for the purpose of creating differences among Churchmen—their intrigues in the Parliament's army—their part in the death of the first Charles—their influencing the non-conformists in their views of toleration—their instigation of the Bishops to enforce the penal laws—their gigantic and well nigh successful exertions under the second James—their intrigues and plots upon the settlement of the Protestant succession—the rebellions of 1715, 1745, &c. and their more recent Agitation ! Agitation ! Agitation ! pregnant as it has been, and, if God prevents not, still will be, with degradation, and disaster, and woe to the British Empire; whatever point of English history we view, to whatever period of the existence of the Reformed Church we direct our gaze, we invariably find the Papist sowing the elements of confusion and sedition, of anarchy and rebellion, among the subjects of a Protestant monarch, and endeavouring to introduce into the very frame-work of society principles calculated to scatter its every atom of durability and firmness to the four winds of heaven; and convulse the body politic till the last death struggle of its attenuated existence shall open the way for the re-establishment of the despotic power of Rome over the minds and consciences of the British people. We believe firmly that Rome would exult with her very loftiest note of triumph; that her belfries would peal forth the most jubilant and ecstatic *Te Deum* to-morrow, were Great Britain precipitated from the high elevation to which she has been exalted among the nations of the earth; and debased to the

very dust. Many Popish writers have actually put their lips to the trumpet already, and sang in high strains of gratulation the predicted decay of her strength and the prostration of her energies. Popery ever has been, Popery ever will be the same; the same in hostility to the Word of God;—the same in inveterate hatred of liberty of conscience, the free use and exercise of any of the moral attributes of man; the same in disregard to the mandate of the Almighty, exalting herself above all that is called God; the same in disregard to the peace and happiness, the temporal and eternal welfare of man; the same in her lust for the blood of the saints; the same in her lying vanities, and uttering lies in hypocrisy; the same in unblushing effrontery, in cruel and relentless persecution, in tyranny and blasphemy, in intolerance and in vice. She will never rest satisfied with the amplest toleration: *aut Cæsar aut nullus*—either mistress of the world or nothing, is inscribed on each cycle of her history; undisputed and undisturbed domination over the bodies and souls of the whole human race, from the emperor to the beggar, is the modest claim engraven upon her brow; and to imagine that she will cease to be restless or cease the agitation and enforcement of her execrable pretensions because concession after concession is made to the avidity with which she urges her suit, is as diagnostic of combined ignorance and madness as to suppose it possible to wean a drunkard from his wine by consigning to him the key of your cellar.

That Popery was not completely annihilated at the Reformation, but suffered still to exist, to annoy, and perplex the Church of Christ, is a part of the inscrutable workings of His providence who is too wise to err, and too good to permit anything but for the ultimate advancement of his own glory and the best interests of his Church on earth. We may, however, find something like a parallel case in the Canaanites being still permitted to dwell in the land to the detriment and annoyance of the children of Israel after they had obtained the promised inheritance. Mr. Lathbury notices this parallel in the following practical remarks:

“While it is our duty to trace the footsteps of Providence in the accomplishment of that event by which the Papacy was laid prostrate in England, it is equally incumbent on us to watch the enemy, who though overthrown at the Reformation, was not completely destroyed. When the Israelites were planted in the land of promise by the strong arm of Jehovah, the nations of Canaan were not utterly rooted out, but were left in an enfeebled state, not sufficiently powerful to overthrow their conquerors and re-establish themselves in their territories, but still strong enough to harass the Jews, and to prove as thorns in their sides, for the purpose of proving them and of reminding them that it

was not by their own might, but by the good hand of their God, that they were established in Canaan: so at the period of the Reformation, Popery received a deadly blow, but it was not extinguished; it was permitted to maintain an existence, and at certain seasons it has appeared more vigorous than at others; nay, there have been periods, since the Reformation, when Popery appeared likely to regain its ascendancy. That it was permitted to remain in the land as a trial of Protestantism there can be no question. By its existence Protestants are reminded of the thralldom in which their fathers were involved, and from which we are happily and mercifully delivered. At the present period the Papacy appears to be gaining strength; at all events, it is putting forth all its energies; and, as in the case of Israel, when they became lukewarm and indifferent, the Canaanitish nations were permitted to obtain certain advantages, and in some instances even to oppress the people; so we may rest assured, that, if we forget our privileges, or lightly esteem our deliverance from Popery, the same wise Being will act in a similar manner towards us, and permit our enemy to make advances, and perhaps to assume a threatening attitude."

The Church of England is exposed to the attacks of Popery in the present day, to a far greater extent than ever were the children of Israel to the assaults of the unexterminated Canaanites. Ever since the calamitous act of 1829, which admitted into the central citadel of our Constitution a band of men sworn by the most solemn oaths to demolish her foundations and raze the entire fabric to the ground, the Church of England has had to contend with the man of sin face to face, to repel attack upon attack, resist and counteract sap and assault of every description; whilst the brazen hoof of Popery has been again and again lifted to crush her to the dust. To use the glowing and indignant words of a Clergyman who writes with a pen of fire: *—

"The Bill of that year replaced the Roman Catholic in the Parliament from which he had been expelled a century before, by the united necessities of religion, freedom, and national safety: the whole experience of our Protestant history had pronounced that evil must follow. And it has followed. From that hour all has been changed: British legislation has lost its stability; England has lost alike her pre-eminence abroad, and her confidence at home; every great Institution of the State has tottered; her Governments have risen and passed away like shadows; the Church in Ireland, bound hand and foot, has been flung into the furnace, and is disappearing from the eye; the Church in England is haughtily threatened with her share of the fiery trial; every remonstrance of the nation is insolently answered by pointing to rebellion, ready to seize its arms in Ireland; Democracy is openly proclaimed as a principle of the State; Popery is triumphantly pre-

* Vide *England the Fortress of Christianity*. By the Rev. George Croly, LL.D. 8vo. pp. 8.

dicted as the universal Religion. To guide and embody all :—a new shape of power has started up in the legislature ; a new element, at once of control and confusion ; a central faction which has both sides at its mercy ; holding the country in contempt, while it fixes its heel on a Cabinet trembling for existence ; possessing all the influence of office, without its responsibility ; and employing unlimited patronage for the purposes of unlimited domination. Yet these may be but the beginning of sorrows !”

There could not have been found deadlier foes to the prosperity of Great Britain and the religion and liberty of her people, than the subjects of the Roman Pontiff; and we are equally convinced, that when found, no more effective or destructive weapon could have been put within their grasp for the dismemberment of the empire, the destruction of her Christianity, and the annihilation of her civil and religious liberty. Political power has emboldened the Papists beyond measure in pressing their unhallowed claims, and increased the repulsive effrontery with which they have ever conducted their assaults upon the bulwarks of our faith, to an all but rebellious height of arrogant and haughty menace. If we look for the place from whence have emanated the heaviest blows and most serious discouragements to our Ecclesiastical establishments, we find it has been from the British Legislature, a body expressly called together for the *defence* of the Church established within these realms; and a body, moreover, which had been rendered by the piety and wisdom of our forefathers, an impregnable buttress to the Church, until its entrance was abandoned by its natural guardians, in an hour of base expediency and unpardonable madness, to the enemies and certain subverters of every Protestant institution. It is to the British Parliament we must look for the development of the designs of the Papacy. Almost the last act of the Papists during the last session, was one which was well calculated to fill the mind of every Protestant with the deepest alarm. It was the introduction of a clause in the New Prisons Bill for England, for appointing and paying Roman Catholic Chaplains in English prisons; “introduced,” as the *Catholic Magazine* informs us, “into it, in the House of Commons, by the *penetrating activity* of the Hon. Mr. Langdale.”

Mr. Langdale, our readers will doubtless recollect as the President of the newly-formed (Roman) Catholic Institute. The unconstitutional and dangerous attempt was happily defeated in the House of Lords, and Mr. Langdale threatens, we perceive, to bring it forward next session, in even an aggravated form. This is only one specimen of the “*penetrating activity*” with which Papists make use of their political power to under-

mine, to subvert, and to destroy, the Protestant Establishment. Must not every one see that such a measure, if adopted, would most seriously compromise the principles on which the constitution of Great Britain is founded; that it would be a virtual denial of the great principle of a National Church: and by removing individuals from under his instruction, materially weaken the influence and interfere with the liberty of the Church of England Clergyman in the discharge of his office; thus contributing, and that in no slight degree, to the ultimate utter rejection, on the part of the State, of the services of the Church happily established amongst us. We, however, on this and many other matters, call to remembrance the consoling fact, that we still have a House of Lords, and "we thank God, and take courage."*

Popery, however, though emboldened and enabled, by the attainment of political power, and a voice in the legislature of the country, she wished most to regather beneath the sway of the triple crown and crosier, to push her political conquests to the utmost, by no means confines her exertions to the limits of the political hemisphere. Wherever in the literary, social, or commercial world, she can obtain a footing, there she is labouring with the same unwearied zeal, the same "penetrating activity," as in the British senate, to reap a harvest of proselytes and promote her interests; to strengthen her stakes and lengthen her cords to their utmost stretch of tension.

We know, upon good authority, that there are, at the moment we write, an incalculable number of Jesuits, under assumed garbs and characters of every variety of description, scattered over the length and breadth of the land, propagating the tenets of the Papacy, and sowing discord and contention wherever they can, straining every nerve to widen the differences existing between different sects of Christians; agitating dissenters against tithes and church-rates; and, in the character of members of the Church of England, broaching doctrines and opinions at direct variance with the spirit of the Gospel and the fundamental principles of the English Church, thereby bringing an unmerited disgrace upon

* His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, in a letter to the writer of this Article, at the time when the Prisons Bill was brought before the House of Lords, speaks of it in a manner worthy of His Grace's uniformly consistent maintenance and advocacy of Protestant principles in that House. His Grace says, "this is another of those dangerous innovations which, little by little, are sapping the foundations of our Establishments and the old Constitution in Church and State." Would that the pure spirit of Protestantism which animates the breast of that distinguished nobleman were diffused throughout the entire mass of our legislative aristocracy!

the Protestant Establishment, and putting weapons into the hands of the ignorant or bigotted schismatic or dissenter, with which to attack the great bulwark of National Christianity. We could narrate many startling anecdotes, which have been communicated to us by friends who have known the parties concerned in the transactions, illustrative of the various plots and intrigues of the Jesuits of the present day, in their assumption of different characters in society, from the Protestant Clergyman down to the bricklayer's labourer, which would fill our hearers with astonishment and no little indignation. They prove, incontestably, as must everybody's experience who have watched the workings of Popery narrowly, or been at all connected with the private or public exertions that are being made to stem the torrent of Popish leaven which is now deluging the land, that what Popery and Jesuitism ever have been throughout the entire period of their being, such are they now; they employ the same carnal weapons, use the same unsanctified means to the attainment of their end, and answer as literally and as truly to every feature in the graphic delineation of Popery sketched by the pen of inspiration, as they did at any former period of their hateful and pestilential existence.

Amongst other artifices and ungodly manœuvres of the Jesuits, there is none, perhaps, to which they have so constant reference, and of which they appear so fond, as the casting calumny and misrepresentation of every kind upon everything Protestant. It is useless to refute their base and groundless aspersions; they reiterate, a thousand times, statements and assertions repeatedly refuted in the most triumphant manner, and appear to imagine, that by incessant repetition, they will at least tire the patience of Protestants, and deter them from again exposing the fallacy of what has been so frequently proved to be false; and that thus falsehood and calumny will obtain entrance into the public mind, and settle down as undisputed and long-established truth in the creed of the unsuspecting and uninquiring million. The book before us exemplifies this trait in the character of Jesuitry, or rather, this characteristic of her unholy warfare in no small degree; and for a further and very palpable proof of the identity of Jesuitism in the present day with that of former times, we would refer our readers to a very valuable and triumphant refutation of the calumnies heaped by modern Jesuits (and Dr. Wiseman in particular) upon Protestant Missions, by the Rev. James Hough, for some time Chaplain to the East India Company, at Madras, and now officiating as Perpetual Curate of Ham, in Surry.

The following description of a Jesuit is as graphic and true

has the following remarks on this impudent and infamous mode of warfare:—

“Most of my readers are aware of the attempts of Popish historians to palliate, if not to justify, the cruelties exercised against the Protestants during this bloody reign. Dr. Lingard gravely assures his readers, that the severities were revived by the excesses of the Gospellers, and by a new conspiracy.*

And, elsewhere, he adds—

“If anything could be urged in extenuation, it must have been the provocation given by the Reformers.†

“He insinuates that the grossest insults were offered to the Queen, and to the priests: but when he comes to proofs he can only adduce a few facts of a few individuals, and these forsooth are to be regarded as evidences of the general disaffection of her Protestant subjects.‡ It would have been strange if the people had not manifested their disappointment at the breach of those promises made by the faithless Queen to the men of Kent (who seated her on the throne), that they should not be disturbed in the profession of their religion. As to outrages, however, there were none. But supposing some of the Protestants had been implicated in rebellion, why were they put to death as heretics, and not as traitors? The truth is, the Papists of the present day would gladly turn away the eyes of Protestants from the cruelties of this inglorious reign; but it behoves us, as Churchmen, to look back upon this period, in order that we may discover the true character of Popery. In the present day, it is restrained from committing excesses; but as its principles are unchanged, we have no reason to believe that its practices would be different, if the restrictions of law and public opinion were removed. At all events Popery cannot be trusted. Its promises may be specious, but what single principle or tenet have the Papists renounced? How, indeed, can they, so long as

* Lingard, Vol. VII. 266.

† Lingard, Vol. VII. 285. Mr. Hallam remarks, “Dr. Lingard has softened and suppressed, till this Queen appears honest and even amiable. A man of sense should be ashamed of such partiality to his sect.”—*Hallam* I. 144.

‡ We quote the following just remark in reference to Dr. Lingard’s defence of Queen Mary: “But those who would diminish this aversion, will do better by avoiding, for the future, such panegyrics on Mary or her advisers, or such insidious extenuations of her persecution as we have lately read, and which do not raise a favourable impression of their sincerity in the principles of toleration to which they profess to have been converted.”—*Hallam*, I. 145.

they retain the monstrous doctrine of infallibility? It is the decision of their church, that all Protestants are heretics, and the doom of heretics is death; can we, then, with the utmost stretch of charity, believe that the flames of Smithfield would not be rekindled, if power was again possessed by the Papacy. As we have seen the fruit of their doctrines in past times, and as from the nature of things their tenets cannot be changed, they surely cannot deem us unreasonable or uncharitable in our belief, that the same principles would lead to the same results, if unrestrained by the authority of law or the force of public opinion.

“As the Princess Elizabeth was known to be attached to the Protestant faith, and as she was the hope of the Protestant party, several attempts were made by her enemies to remove her out of the way. Her preservation amid so many dangers was truly wonderful. At one time the Papists had resolved on her destruction, in order that the hopes of the Protestants might be extinguished: the warrant for her execution was actually signed by many members of the council, and the signature of the Queen was alone wanting to give effect to the document. From some cause or other, Mary relented, and Elizabeth was spared. After the death of the Queen, Philip confessed that he had been instrumental in preserving Elizabeth’s life, against the repeated solicitations of the crafty Gardiner: his interposition, however, did not spring from pity, but from motives of policy, for he hoped in the event of Mary’s death, to secure his position in England by marrying Elizabeth. When Dr. Lingard arrives at this period of our history, he endeavours to make the merit of Philip more conspicuous, by telling his readers, that Elizabeth was concerned in a conspiracy against her sister, and that Philip spared her life in the hope of marrying her afterwards. That her life was spared at the intercession of Philip is certain; but that she was engaged in any conspiracy is false, and that Dr. Lingard should assert the contrary is surprising. Elizabeth’s danger arose not from her politics, but from her religion. Elsewhere, the Romish historian observes that the emperor urged the execution of the princess, and that she was saved by the interference of Gardiner; but there is abundant evidence to prove, that the prelate was one of her bitterest enemies, and that he was closely connected with those plots whose aim was her destruction. Amidst all these dangers, Elizabeth was spared; she was under the Divine protection, and not a hair of her head was injured. Great and glorious deeds were to be accomplished, and Elizabeth was the destined instrument in their execution. In her case the words of Holy Writ were verified: ‘He disappointeth the devices

the crafty, so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise.' Her enemies were placed under restraint; and though they were daily plotting her ruin, yet they were not permitted to injure her person."

Take the following brief sketch of Mary's reign in connection with the above:—

"Mary's reign was short, inglorious, and bloody. It is a dark spot in our history, and furnishes a black page in our annals: yet it is a period pregnant with instruction. To it may the Protestant revert for evidence of the persecuting nature of Popery; and whatever may be alleged by spurious liberalism in proof that Popery is changed, or against the injustice of condemning the principles of Popery for the practices of three centuries ago, let not Protestants lose sight of one single fact, namely, that the Papists themselves have never asserted that their views on the subject of heresy and persecution have undergone any change. It is stated, and there appears to be no reason for questioning the statement, that Mary's last days were rendered miserable by the recollection of the blood that had been shed during her short reign. She had been taught by Gardiner and Bonner to believe that by putting heretics to death, she was doing God service; but when death appeared near, she began to view her actions in their proper light; and the remorse which she experienced was undoubtedly deepened by the review of those events which will cast a shade on her memory to the latest posterity."

Well may Popery long to pervert and nullify the concurrent testimony of every nation's history. Well may she employ her most exalted powers, and pay her ablest men, to weaken or destroy the indelible blot fastened upon her escutcheon by the enormities of far-back ages; well may she strain every energy and descend to every mean and dishonest and contemptible trick, to erase from the tablet of time the damning proofs of her identity with the denounced and execrable *Babylon* of the Scriptures of inspiration. And mad beyond all computation should we be, if, even in the midst of the present restless and feverish anxiety for novelty, no matter of what kind—grossly insane should we be, if we believed for one instant, the monstrous dogma now sought to be promulgated amongst us by the emissaries of Rome, that the much-vaunted liberalism of the day has produced a change in the spirit of Rome. The liberalism of the day must indeed be possessed of gigantic influence, nay of power equal to omnipotence, if, as we are repeatedly told, she has actually effected a mutation for the better in that which ever was and still remains "infallible." Mad, and worse than mad, must the people of England be, if, with the broad blown banner of haughty Rome flaunting to their gaze, with the blood-dyed inscription "*semper eadem*" burning in characters of flame upon it, the

conviction of the solemn truth flashes not across their mind with irresistible energy; that the same measure she meted out in the plenitude of her power to our martyred forefathers, will she measure out to us, should we, by our lethargy or impiety, suffer her again to establish her despotic sway in these highly-favoured islands. If there is one truth more constantly developed than another in the history of England, it is this, that just as Popish influence prevailed or declined in the councils of the empire, did the kingdom sink or rise in the scale of nations; that exactly in proportion as Protestant principles were acknowledged or denied and compromised by the legislature of the country, did greatness or disaster, glory or defeat, weakness or power, characterise her policy, attend her arms, and inscribe its hieroglyphic on the records of her existence.

We say again, and we wish that every syllable we utter could break in a voice of thunder upon the ear of every drowsy and sleepy native of Great Britain, that the people of England are mad, and worse than mad, if they tamely sit still and see Popery progress with the colossal strides she is now making towards the subjection of our justly loved country to the triple crown and crosier of Rome; if they are willing to barter away a nation's welfare for the luxury of their own personal ease and quiet, sacrifice the temporal and eternal well-being of their countrymen, for the effeminate indulgence of their slothful propensities and morbid unwillingness to disturb the death slumber in which society is wrapped, and to immolate the cause of truth, of national greatness, and of civil and religious freedom, upon the altars of their own egotistical and insensate ambition. But we hope better things of our countrymen—we entertain sanguine expectations that they will not fold their arms and permit the deadly soporific of modern liberalism to steal away their senses, and bind up their faculties in death-like torpor, when they are called upon by every consideration that is manly and dignified, by every sentiment at all connected with the greatness of a country and the happiness and liberties of her people, by every emotion of benevolence, by every dictate of a pure and lofty patriotism, and above all by every feeling of philanthropy that exists in the human breast, and by every breath of gratitude and every pulse of piety that beats and throbs in the pious heart, to be up and doing, to gird up the loins of their minds with alacrity and zeal, and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. "Curse ye Meroz," are the memorable words of the Deity himself; "Curse ye Meroz," said the angel of the Lord; "curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

Let us solemnly consider the obligations we are under to defend that pure scriptural faith from whence we have derived both nationally and individually so many and so great privileges and blessings, and contrasting the difference between our own peaceful condition and the tempestuous and fiery trial-time of persecution and martyrdom through which our forefathers passed into glory, let us with gratitude and thanksgiving willingly and unreluctantly give ourselves seriously to the same task of beating back the advancing hosts of the aliens, and contesting every inch of ground with the hostile and mighty advocates of a corrupt and persecuting creed. We have received from our sainted ancestry a holy and thrice-hallowed legacy—a gift, for the preservation of which, and the handing it down to us, they willingly passed to the stake, accounting cruelty and torment, nay death itself, welcome, could they by their sufferings but bequeath to us unimpaired so invaluable an heir-loom. What they were martyred to cherish, what they poured out their blood like water to preserve, that let us not hold common or cheap. Posterity as well as the present generation, call upon us to hold fast that we have, to retain, even at the expence of our life's blood, the precious blessings of a pure creed, an open Bible, and liberty of conscience. Let us then pledge ourselves upon a holier altar than that by which the youthful Hannibal was sworn, to have no peace with the impious system which tramples in the dust alike the honour of God and the happiness of man—which spreads its net only to catch men's souls and plunge them in everlasting perdition—which exalts itself above all that is called God, and thirsts for the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. *Nulla pax cum Roma*, be this our motto, and in the name of the God of truth let us prepare for the battle, nothing doubting that in the severe and searching struggle fast approaching, we shall be enabled to quit ourselves like men, and, David-like, prevail with the sling and the stone of scriptural truth against all the sophistry and deceitful craft of the Goliaths of the Papacy.

But Mr. Lathbury's work is not only valuable from its being a condensed and authentic description of the workings of Popery and the means that in former times have been used successfully to stay her advances, but as containing, at the end, a very excellent chapter devoted to the substantiating the charge of novelty, heresy, and schism against the Church of Rome. This is an important labour, and the properly effecting which is calculated to produce an immensity of good in the present day, when thousands of the unwary and those who have not laid the foundations of their faith very deeply, are being deluded and hoodwinked by the effrontery with which Papists are continually alleging the

antiquity and the unity of their own Church, and the distraction and divisions among Protestants. If unity of opinion on any subject carries weight with it, let us remind the Papist that there is no one sentiment in holding which Protestants of every denomination and shade of difference so cordially and unanimously agree, as that the Church of Rome is the Apostate Church denounced with so fearful and terrific a condemnation in the Word of God :

“ The Popish boast of unity may, however (writes Mr. Lathbury), be easily disposed of. It consists in nothing more than the bare recognition of the authority of the Pope, by all parties in the Church, while at the same time they are permitted to follow the particular rules, and to adopt the particular opinions, of their respective orders. How can it be shown that the adoption of one single point—the supremacy of the Pope, constitutes a centre of union more binding than that which is adopted by Protestants, namely, the recognition of the Sacred Volume.”

In recommending the study of the primitive fathers, not for the purpose of establishing any doctrine, but to unmask the Papists in their shallow pretence of antiquity, Mr. Lathbury says—

“ The Papists have committed two crimes, with respect to the fathers, of no slight enormity. They have corrupted the text of the genuine fathers; and they have fabricated spurious treatises, and published them as their genuine works. To these nefarious practices have they resorted, for the purpose of propping up a sinking cause; and it would be strange indeed if, with so many shifts, they could not make a show of defence when the edifice of Popery is in danger. It has been incontrovertibly established by James, in his learned work on the Corruptions of the Fathers, that no less than one hundred and eighty-seven treatises have been forged by the Papists, and attempted to be palmed upon the world as the genuine works of ancient writers. The same learned writer points out fifty passages in the acknowledged works of the fathers, which have been corrupted, mangled, or interpolated. The celebrated ‘*Decretal Epistles*,’ as is well known, were fabricated for the purpose of supporting the spiritual authority of the Pope; while the treatise called the ‘*Donation of Constantine*’ was intended to uphold the Pontiff’s temporal power. Both were notorious forgeries.”

One more extract and we have done—

“ In all their attempts, the emissaries of Rome aimed at the destruction of the Church of England. Why? because they dreaded her influence over the people; because she was the chief bulwark in the reign of Elizabeth and the four Stuarts against the re-establishment of Popery. When the Church of England was voted down, in the time of Charles I. by the long ‘Parliament,’ there were great rejoicings in the Popish councils at Rome. They hoped that the removal of the Church would lead to endless divisions among Protestants, and that

the people would eventually take refuge in Popery. There is not a single sentence in Holy Writ more regarded by Papists than this: 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' Upon this maxim they have ever acted; nor did they conceive that any more effectual method of dividing Protestants could be resorted to than the destruction of the National Church, and the prevention of Nonconformists from uniting with its members As in the days of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, the Papists did not dread the Puritans, so neither in the present day do they entertain any apprehensions from the Dissenters; but as during the period alluded to they were alarmed at the influence of the Church of England, so now their fears arise from the very same quarter. Their efforts are consequently, as in time past, all directed against the Church of England; and were their exertions to be successful they would reap an abundant harvest from those endless divisions, which would be consequent on the destruction of the Church, and which would lead many to shelter themselves under the wing of Popery. The Papacy is making rapid advances in England in the present day; but how much more rapid would they be, were it not for the existence and the efforts of the Church of England. In every town and in every village of the land, notwithstanding the unfaithfulness of some of her ministers, and the carelessness and indifference of others, the Church still, in her liturgy, her articles, and services, raises a bulwark against Popery, which all their efforts are unable to shake. The Dissenters of the present day may not probably see any cause for apprehending danger from the destruction of the Established Church. They may perhaps imagine that they should unite in one common bond against Popery. In this expectation they would undoubtedly be deceived. The Jesuits are sagacious men, and they would easily succeed in creating divisions sufficient to occupy their undivided attention. There are in the very principles of Dissent the elements of discord; and the Jesuits would speedily find the means of managing those elements so as to effect the destruction of Dissenters. I have pointed out some of those methods resorted to by our ancestors to counteract the machinations of the Papists. The pulpit was one chief means of awakening the people to a sense of their danger; let the same engine be still employed, both by Churchmen and Dissenters. We may attack the errors of Popery while we feel the greatest tenderness towards the persons of the Papists. While the pulpit is employed on the one hand, the press may be used with great effect on the other. The present is a reading age—not indeed a thinking one—nor are the people generally disposed to read abstruse and profound treatises on any subject; but still certain works must be produced to satisfy the appetite that has been created. It is an age for cheap publications, and a wide and very important field is open to Protestants. We may rest assured that, unless we occupy the ground, it will be occupied by the emissaries of evil. If we do not sow the good seed, the enemy will sow tares. Hence the necessity of making use of the press to counteract the machinations of the Papists, and to make the people acquainted with Protestant principles. Tracts and cheap periodicals

would find buyers and readers, if well informed Protestants would take the trouble, in their respective spheres, to direct the attention of the people to them."

Let the members of the Church of England only maintain the integrity of their churchmanship, and by unity of effort concentrate their vast power into one effective and impenetrable phalanx, and they will render her impregnable alike to the open and combined attacks of infidelity, neology, and dissent, and the more subtle approach by, sap and excavation, of the crafty Jesuit. The Church of England is alike the fortress of our liberties, the ark of our scriptural faith, and the repository of our form of sound doctrine; let her members only prove true and valiant in resisting the encroachments of her foes, in combatting the open assault, and exposing the clandestine and subtle means adopted for her overthrow, and she need quail at no battle cry of her assailants, fear no rude alarm from without, nor tremble at the multiplied banners that are raised against her; but in simple and operative reliance upon His aid who never failed her yet, doubt not but that she shall still go forth conquering and to conquer, till the last dark storm-cloud shall have rolled away from her horizon, the last enemy shall have been put to flight, the last battle won, and the final triumph of the principles of righteousness over the black and discordant elements of evil shall be eternally consummated. Her foundations are laid deep in the rock of ages, her pillars are apostolic, her walls cemented with the blood of countless martyrs, and her battlements adorned with much that is venerable in antiquity for piety and renown; and, to crown all, and supply the most consoling element in that just confidence which enables us to throw to the winds our fears for her safety and hurl to her enemies our proud and emphatic defiance, the arm which supports her is Almighty, and the shield with which she is encompassed is that of the Omnipotent. In concluding this notice of the "History of Popery" and Mr. Lathbury's useful work, which has grown under our hands to a far greater length than we originally intended, we can only again commend them to the attentive perusal of our readers, with the fervent prayer that they may stimulate the lukewarm, awaken the careless, serve as a nutritious aliment to the Protestantism of the zealous, and convey to the minds of every reader the solemn conviction of the importance and imperative necessity for combined and unceasing activity and exertion among the members of our Protestant Establishment. The same danger with which our forefathers have been threatened from the movements of the Church of Rome, are clearly shewn by Mr. Lathbury to be now threatening us; and if, as we believe

he very convincingly demonstrates, this be the alarming truth, surely no Protestant can withhold his mite of exertion in contributing to the conservation of all that is dear to us in time and priceless in eternity. With the example of that noble cloud of witnesses, the illustrious martyrs of our country, before us, let us buckle on our armour with alacrity, thank God for the success with which he crowned former efforts for the emancipation of England from the thralldom of Papal Rome, and the preservation of her Protestant charter, and taking courage from the survey of their experience, and the glowing records of the triumphs, be dauntless and unwavering in our opposition to the same haughty power.

ART. III.—*The Revival of Diocesan Synods: a Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Rochester, in April, 1838.* By WALTER KING, M.A., Archdeacon of Rochester. Printed at the Request of the Clergy. 8vo. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

AMONG the numerous subjects connected with the Church, to which the notice of the public has been directed for some years past, there is one, which we consider to possess peculiar importance, and which has nevertheless attracted a far inferior degree of attention to that which it merits. The subject to which we allude is the convocation of the clergy. It is true, the clergy, during the last few years, have begun, in a few instances, to turn their attention towards this matter. In some dioceses, petitions have been addressed to the crown by the clerical body; and some of the archdeacons, in their charges, have spoken at greater or lesser length upon this point. If we are not misinformed, the clergy of the archdeaconry of Dorset have petitioned her Majesty upon the subject of the convocation, and the Archdeacon of Dorset (whose excellent charge, delivered in 1837, we had the pleasure of reviewing in a former number) has treated of the provincial synods of the clergy in his charge delivered during the past summer, but which has not yet been published. The venerable author of the pamphlet before us has also discussed the subject of diocesan synods. But we are not aware that any person has treated at length, and in a detailed manner, of the origin, nature, and successive history of the different public assemblies of the clergy.

It is, therefore, our intention, in the present Article, to present our readers with some account of the different assemblies of the clergy in this country from an early period.

Assemblies of the clergy appear to have been held very frequently from the beginning of Christianity: and under heathen emperors, as we are informed by Eusebius, Cyprian, and Tertullian. The necessity for such assemblies, even in the earliest periods of the Church, is self-evident. During the lifetime of the Apostles, when the Church was governed by holy men, who spake under the immediate inspiration of God, we find questions of discipline arising among the disciples of Christianity, which required for their decision the assembling of themselves together. How much more frequently then, would such questions occur at an after period, when the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit had departed? The earliest assemblies of the clergy were composed of the bishops and presbyters who were seated, and of the deacons and people who stood before them, and who were little more than witnesses of what passed in the synod. The presbyters, indeed, in every city, formed a necessary standing council to their respective bishop, and together with the bishop, formed a diocesan synod, in which they met to give their advice and consent upon all important matters. This was the practice of the primitive Church, and the same custom was preserved in England after it had declined elsewhere. Some remains of this ancient ecclesiastical discipline are still observable in the capitular bodies attached to our Cathedral Churches, which were originally intended to act as a select body of priests for the assistance of the bishop in the management of the affairs of his diocese. The assembly next in degree to the diocesan synod, was the provincial assembly or council of the province, which comprehended within its limits several dioceses. These assemblies were originally held as often as twice in each year, but afterwards, from various reasons, they were held only once, during the same period. The persons of whom these assemblies were composed, appear to have varied at different times. By an account given of one of them held in this country in the year 1129, it would seem, that the following persons were summoned to it, viz: bishops, abbots, archdeacons, all the priors, monks, and canons who were in the religious houses in England, and finally all who had the care of religion committed to them, by which last description it is understood, that the parochial clergy were designated, the words in the Latin translation of the chronicle are, "*omnes denique quorum Curæ Religio erat commissa.*" At a later period, when synods were more frequently held, and the expense and trouble of attendance had become burthensome to the clergy, it was often the custom for the dean or prior of the chapter or convent, to bring up instruments of proxy to the synod, which empowered him to act for his chapter or con-

vent, and for the archdeacons also in the same manner to represent the diocesan clergy. But in the Council of Reading, which took place in the seventh year of the reign of Edward I., it was ordered, that the clergy of each diocese should appear by two proctors chosen from their own body, which has been the practice ever since. The inferior clergy, who were members of these assemblies, possessed an equal power with all the other members of deliberating upon and assenting to those matters which were brought before them, which appears not only from the words of the constitution of the Council of Reading, to which we have referred, and which run thus :

“Item præcipimus, ut veniant duo Electi ad min⁹s a Clero Episcopatum singulorum, qui auctoritatem habeant una nobiscum tractare de his quæ Ecclesiæ communi utilitati expediunt Anglicanæ.”

but also from the ancient forms of the archbishop's summonitory letters, which ran, “ad tractandum una nobiscum.”

The constitutions passed in those synods always ran in the name, and were stated to be passed with the consent and approbation of, the inferior clergy, even when they were only represented by the archdeacons to whom they had given procuratorial instruments. Thus in the Council of Merton, 42. H. 8. the constitutions which were there made, are stated to have passed, “de unanimi assensu et consilio Prælatorum Religiosorum, et totius Cleri Ecclesiæ;” and towards the end, the same form is repeated in a still more clear and detailed manner: “Archiepiscopi et episcopi de consensu et approbatione inferiorum prælatorum, capitulorum, cathedralium, et conventualium, nec non universitatis totius cleri Angliæ hæc prædicta communiter et concorditer providerunt.”

This privilege appears to have been possessed by the inferior clergy, not only at a later period, but even in the Saxon times, for we find that simple presbyters frequently subscribed their names to the constitutions passed by councils, and often in great numbers. At the Synod of Cloveshoe, held in 803, we find, besides twenty-six abbotts who were present, that nearly forty simple presbyters attended, who were ranked under the several bishops from whose dioceses they came, and also a few of the clergy of a lower order. In the preface to the Canons passed in an earlier synod, held at the same place in the year 747, we meet with these words :

“Sacri ordinis præsules, cum plurimis sacerdotibus domini, et minoribus quoque ecclesiastici gradus dignitatibus, ad locum synodalem, cum venerabili Archiepiscopo Cudberto convenerunt, et de unitate ecclesiæ, et concordia pacis tractanda, confirmanda—que pariter considerunt.”

Archbishop Chicheley also, in his letters mandatory to the

Bishop of London, expressly recognizes this privilege by the language which he employs, and makes it very evident that it was of long established usage; in one place his words are, “De fratrum nostrorum et cleri in eadem convocatione præsentium voluntatibus consilio, et assensu.” In another, “De nostrorum fratrum ac cleri Provinciæ consilio et assensu.” In another, “De venerabilium confratrum nostrorum aliorum que prælatorum, et cleri provinciæ consensu puriter et assensu.” To shew how firmly established was the right of the inferior clergy, not only to deliberate, but also to decide in synods, we find it laid down in a paper drawn up in the reign of Henry VIII. and signed by four bishops: “In all the ancient councils of the Church, in matters of faith and interpretation of Scripture, no man made definitive subscription, but bishops and priests; forasmuch as the declaration of the Word of God pertaineth unto them.” But although the consent of the inferior clergy, together with that of the higher, was necessary, in order for any measure to pass through the provincial synod, yet the archbishop was said to decree and ordain, and the provincial constitutions were published on the last day of the synod by the archbishop. It was not necessary to obtain permission from the sovereign, or, whilst the domination of Rome endured in this country, from the Bishop of Rome, for the purpose of holding one of these assemblies, nor does the authority of either the one or the other appear to have been requisite previously to the time of Henry VIII., in order to make canons. It was only necessary for the clergy to take care not to exceed their proper limits, either in the matter or manner of their decrees, and that they should make such constitutions only as would not be revoked or annulled by the sovereign. The metropolitans were obliged, by the canons, to call these synods together once in each year. But there was no more necessity for them to ask leave to summon these assemblies, than there is in the present day for a bishop to do so previously to his citation of the clergy of his diocese, and the officers of the church to a visitation. The archbishop, it is true, sometimes convened these assemblies together at the instance of the sovereign, which was signified to him by a royal writ, but even in that case, so clearly recognized was his right to summon his clergy, that he called them together by his own authority. And whether the assembly was convened at the instance of the sovereign or not, it appears that the archbishop always dissolved it.

A very remarkable instance of the power of dissolving these assemblies, possessed by the archbishop, occurred in the last convocation, in the reign of Henry IV., which, although called

at the instance of the sovereign, signified to the archbishop by a royal writ, was so much considered to be held under the authority of the archbishop, that it is recorded to have continued its sittings for nearly two months under the king's successor, Henry V. without a dissolution.

Until the time of Archbishop Chicheley, convocations were frequently held, even whilst the Parliament was sitting, without any other writ from the king but what was contained in the bishop's summons, with the clause *Præmunientes* inserted. After the eighth year of Henry VI. the clergy, if they met by the king's letter, enjoyed the benefit of the Act of Parliament of that year, and, therefore, it is to be supposed usually desired it in order to gain the parliamentary protection.

When these assemblies met, writs were often sent to them by the king, forbidding them to attempt any thing against his crown and dignity, and these prohibitions are considered to have been tacit permissions of such assemblies on the part of the sovereign. It certainly appears that the right of the clergy to assemble in these synods was fully recognised on the part of the crown, for otherwise the sovereign would most probably have forbidden them to meet and sit at all, instead of only forbidding them to attempt any thing against his crown and dignity. But this appears very seldom to have been done.

The king had also his proctors or commissioners occasionally in these assemblies, who proposed, protested, and appealed in his behalf, but they were always persons in holy orders. Lay persons, indeed, frequently carried the royal commands to these assemblies, but the only individuals who at any time remained to act for the sovereign were clergymen. It is a remarkable circumstance, that amongst the different grievances which were brought forward, we never find any mention made of a want of convocations. The clergy, on the contrary, sometimes complained of being called together too frequently, and of being kept sitting for too long a time, and, therefore, requested a dismissal, and we also find the archbishop frequently excusing himself on this head in his letter of summons.

We have hitherto considered the assemblies of the clergy as provincial synods, held under the authority of the law ecclesiastical. But there is another point of view under which they may be considered, which is, as attendant upon the Parliament of England.

It appears that during the Saxon times, the clergy, both the bishops and parochial clergy, attended at, and formed a component part of, the general assembly of the nation. The Norman conquest made no change in this respect, for William the

First continued to summon the clergy to the assembly of the nation together with the laity. The lands which the bishops, the abbots, and many of the inferior clergy enjoyed, in right of their benefices, were now held by the feudal tenure, and their possessors consequently were obliged to be present at the assemblies of the states of the realm, together with the other crown tenants. After a certain period it seems that the clergy became unwilling to meet in the same assembly with the laity, and in the reign of Henry II. as is most probable, a separation began between the spiritual and temporal part of the community, which continued to increase during the reigns of his successors. The clergy now appear to have declined to render obedience to the lay-summons, with the exception only of those who were obliged to attend the great councils of the realm, in virtue of their offices or tenures, so that in the sixth year of King John, when the king was desirous to have all the abbots and priors present in Parliament, he was forced to cite them through the bishops of the respective dioceses, and not by an immediate summons. One of the causes which led to this separation was, the dispute which had arisen between the two metropolitical sees of Canterbury and York, in consequence of the latter refusing to be under subjection to the former, and which ended in it being solemnly determined that the Archbishop of York and his clergy should attend the conciliary meetings and summons of the Archbishop of Canterbury. This rule was, however, broken through after some years, and the clergy of the two provinces of Canterbury and York came to meet in two separate provincial assemblies.

Edward I., however, finding the clergy thus divided from the laity and from one another, resolved to restore the old custom, and to bring them nationally to Parliament. The mode which he adopted for effecting this purpose was, by inserting into the bishop's writ that clause which begins with the word "*Præmunientes*," and summoning, by means of it, all the secular clergy who were under the rank of bishops, either in person or else by their proxies, and also those religious persons who composed the chapters attached to cathedral churches. The monks and the other regular clergy, who professed to be entirely separated from worldly affairs, were allowed the privilege of being left out of this summons, the crown being contented with directing particular writs to all the great abbots and priors, whether holding by tenure of barony or not, without requiring the attendance of their convents.

The numbers of the lower clergy who had been cited by the archbishop to the convocation had always borne some proportion to those of the lower laity, who were at the same time called

to Parliament, and the summons by the clause "*Præmunientes*" when first put in force by Edward I. continued the practice. Under its authority, some of the clergy were ordered to appear for each diocese (the county Christian), and some for the cathedral clergy of those cities which sent members to Parliament. The deans and archdeacons also were comprised in the same writ of summons. Not only were the numbers of the clergy in some degree proportionable to those of the lay members of the Parliament, but the powers with which they came were also originally the same. Their first writs of summons ran equally, "*ad tractandum, ordinandum, et faciendum*;" and when the one class were summoned, "*ad ordinandum*" only, or "*ad faciendum et consentiendum*," it appears that the other were summoned in a similar manner.

The clergy, however, appear to have considered the clause "*Præmunientes*" under which they were summoned, as a burthen imposed upon them, and as an inroad upon their privileges. They consequently exerted themselves to evade its authority, but without success, at least during the reign of Edward I. for we find in the records of the last Parliament of his reign, an entry of the proxies of every bishop, abbot, prior, dean, and archdeacon who did not appear personally in Parliament, and also of the clergy of every chapter and diocese. They prevailed, however, so far with Edward II. that he made use of the power of the archbishop, together with his own, in convening them, and the practice in his reign was, when the bishop's writ with the clause "*Præmunientes*" went out, to send out two other writs to the two metropolitans, directing them to cite those persons in their respective provinces, who were summoned severally by the bishop's writ. A still further accommodation was afterwards granted to the clergy, and it was arranged, that although the clause "*Præmunientes*" should still summon them to meet parliamentarily, yet it would be understood that sufficient obedience would be rendered to it, if the clergy should meet provincially, although not at the same place with the Parliament, yet about the same time, and for the same purpose, to be ready to hear what should be proposed by the king. The clause "*Præmunientes*," however, was not rendered useless or insignificant by this mode of acting, for the bishop, when he received his summons to Parliament, still transmitted it to those of the lower clergy who were concerned, and they continued to make their returns to it; those of them who were not to attend in person, empowering their proctors to appear and *consent* for them in Parliament, according to the tenor of the bishop's writ, although these proctors sat afterwards and acted

in convocation. An instance of such a procuratorial power occurs as low as 1507, and another of an execution of the *præmunientes* by the bishop, lower still in the reign of Edward the Sixth. In this manner the forms were kept up, and the king's right of summoning the clergy was asserted and acknowledged, and provided that they were assembled, which was the object which the crown had in view, they were permitted to carry this into effect in the manner most conformable to ecclesiastical usage, and to attend the Parliament, not in one body as they were summoned, but in two provincial assemblies. This was at first done by the connivance of the crown; the archbishop, of his own accord, sending out a provincial citation concurrently with the bishop's writ of summons; in consequence of which, and of these provincial meetings being tacitly accepted in place of the clergy's resort to the Parliament, it became necessary for the king to employ his authority also in convening them, since otherwise it would have been left at the discretion of the archbishop whether there should be any meeting or not. This gave origin to the custom of issuing out two convocation writs when a new Parliament was to be chosen, which settled into an established rule during the reign of Edward III. The clergy, therefore, were summoned by the archbishop, at the king's order or letter of request, as it was then deemed and styled, although it ran in these words, "*Rogando mandamus*," and although the time and place of the assembling of the clergy were peremptorily fixed by it. The Archbishop of York also received a writ for his province, in the same manner as the Archbishop of Canterbury did for the one under his jurisdiction, but with this difference, that he was to convene the clergy of his province a fortnight later than the meeting of the other province. The convocation of the province of Canterbury also originally met about a week later than the Parliament, in order probably that the bishops and parliamentary abbots might have time to attend both assemblies. This practice continued throughout the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II., until the reign of Henry IV. in and after which time the clergy held their assemblies during and near the session of Parliament, but not thoroughly concurrent with it. But from the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. the clergy were in the habit of meeting and departing within a day of the Parliament. From the time of William III. the two assemblies have both met on the same day.

The clergy, therefore, continued still to attend the Parliament in two provincial assemblies or convocations, which appear to have kept to the same forms, rules, and manner of sitting and acting as those practised in Parliament. Amongst other resem-

blances, the instruments which empowered the proctors of the clergy to act for the several dioceses, were drawn up almost in the same form with those for the knights of the shires; they also received wages for their attendance, and their wages were laid on the dioceses, with the same allowances of exemption as those which were laid on the counties. A curious incidental proof, that the convocation of the clergy formed a part of the Parliament, occurs in the fact, that these proctors are expressly stated in the records of the time to be entitled to these wages on account of their services *in parliament*, although, strictly speaking, they only sat in a convocation held concurrently with it. In the reign of Edward III. the abbot of Leicester obtained a discharge from personal attendance on the Parliament on condition, as the patent declares, “Quod dictus abbas et successores sui in procuratores ad hujus modi Parliamenta et concilia per clerum mittendos consentiant, et, ut moris est, expensis contribuunt eorundem.” Another instance occurs in a writ in Fitz-Herbert, forbidding the archdeacon to compel the king’s clerks in chancery attending his Parliaments, although beneficed in the diocese, “ad contribuendum ratione beneficiorum suorum Expensis Procuratorum qui ad dictum Parliamentum pro clero dictæ diœces. venerunt, seu aliorum procuratorum, quos ad alia Parliamenta, &c. per nos nunc tenenda venire continget.” This writ issued by authority of Parliament.

The proctors of the clergy enjoyed in one circumstance a privilege not possessed by the representatives of the laity, for they were allowed upon occasion to appoint other proxies to act in their stead, if their instruments of appointment ran in a particular form. The members of convocation also enjoyed Parliamentary privileges, which, although previously possessed by them, were solemnly settled upon them in the eighth year of Henry VI. The lower House of Convocation frequently joined with the House of Commons in the same parliamentary requests, and it appears that in these requests and on other occasions also, they were reputed and called a part of the community of the realm. A parliamentary petition of the 7th and 8th of Henry IV. begins thus, “The Commons of your realm, as well spiritual as temporal, most humbly pray.” And to come down as low as the 35th of Henry VIII. a proclamation of the same year, recites that, “The nobles and commons, both spirytual and temporal, assembled in our court of Parlianente, have upon goode, lawful, and virtuous groundes, and for the publique weale of this our realme, by one hole assente graunted, and annexed, knytte and unyed to the crowne imperyall of the same the title, digni-

tye, and style of Supreme Heade in erthe, ymmmediately under God, of the Church of England."

Numberless instances might be adduced to prove the intimate connexion between Convocation and the Parliament, but we will content ourselves with a few only. In the 10th of Edward III. a writ was issued to the Archbishop of York, reciting that the clergy of the province of Canterbury had given the king a tenth *in Parlamento nostro Westminster*, and exciting him and his clergy to follow their example. In the 43rd year of the same reign, we find a writ commencing thus:—

"Rex Archiepiscopo Cant, salutem, qualiter negotia nostra tam nos et Statum Regni nostri quam necessariam defensionem ejusdem concernentia ac onera nobis per hoc incumbentia vobis et aliis in ultimo Parlamento nostro existentibus plenius exposuimus vos non latet. Ad quorum onerum supportationem absque adjutorio fidelium nostrorum non sufficimus, sicut scitis; propter quod aliquod subsidium congruum in supportationem tantorum onerum a vobis et aliis de clero dioceseos et provincie vestrarum in dicto Parlamento tunc existentibus nobis concedi petivimus," &c.

The great deed of entail in the 8th year of Henry IV. by which the crown was settled on his heirs male, and which was witnessed by the great men and by Sir J. Typtot, the speaker, in behalf of the whole body of the Commons, recites, "Quod in Parlamento nostro apud Westminster, 7^o die Julii, anno Regni nostri 7^o per nos de consensu et avisamento omnium prælatorum Magnatum et Procerum ac Cleri et communitatis regni nostri Angliæ fuerit statutum et ordinatum;" and proceeds to make void what had been so ordained in these words, "Nos igitur—ad instantem petitionem eorundem Prælatorum Magnatum Procerum, Cleri et Communitatis supradictæ, et de eorum omnium et singulorum voluntate et assensu expressis, necnon nostrâ et præsentis Parlamenti nostri auctoritate statutum et ordinationem prædictam cassamus et adnullamus—Nec non ad eorundem Prælatorum Magnatum, Procerum, Cleri et Communitatis prædictæ petitionem et rogatum ac de eorum consensu concordi et auctoritate," &c.

These parliamentary meetings of the clergy were at first *congregationes*, or *convocationes cleri*, but were not, therefore, *concilia provincialia*, which last were extraordinary assemblies for transacting ecclesiastical affairs alone, whilst the former were originally held for civil purposes, and for the common business of the state. When Archbishop Stratford called a council of his province, the preamble of his letters summonitory acknowledged both the obligation he was under by the canons to

assemble this council yearly, and also that he had omitted so to do for the last eight years, although doubtless, during the same period, he had often convened the clergy of his province to Parliament. But this distinction did not last long. The business of provincial councils in the course of time came to be transacted in the ordinary congregations of the clergy, and both the one and the other were styled convocations, until at last provincial councils, properly so called, ceased altogether, and parliamentary convocations succeeded in their place; the frequency and regular occurrence of which afforded the clergy an opportunity of transacting all those matters which had been done in the provincial synods. When Archbishop Warham, in 1509, called together a synod by his own authority, for the redress of abuses and reformation of manners, his mandate warned it to meet a few days after the Parliament, and styled it, not a provincial council, but a convocation of the clergy, and this term appears afterwards to have been strictly applied to signify the parliamentary meetings of the clergy. Camden describes this assembly thus:—"Synodus que Convocatio Cleri Dicitur, et semper simul cum Parlamento habetur." And to shew the customary nature of this assembly, we need only refer to the words in which the warrant to the keeper of the great seal for issuing out writs for Parliament was expressed in the time of James I. "Whereas we are resolved to have a Parliament at ———. These are to will and require you forthwith, upon receipt hereof, to issue forth our writs of summons to all the peers of our kingdom; and also all other usual writs for the electing of such knights, citizens, and burgesses, as are to serve therein; and withal to issue out all usual writs for the summoning of the clergy of both provinces in their Houses of Convocation."

Thus it appears, according to Bishop Atterbury—

"That, as far back as we have any memoirs of the civil or ecclesiastical affairs of this kingdom, it appears that the clergy and laity met together in the great councils of the realm: that this they did, in the Saxon times, and for some reigns after the conquest, nationally; joining closely with the laity in civil debates, and taking their sanction along with them in all ecclesiastical acts and ordinances; that they divided afterwards from the laity, and from one another, and attended the Parliament, not in one body, but in two provincial synods, held under their several archbishops. That though it does not clearly appear when this practice first had its rise, yet sure we are, that it is between four and five hundred years old, and has for so long at least regularly obtained; excepting only the interruption that was given to it by the premunitory clause, inserted into the bishop's writs; which once again warned, and brought the clergy nationally to Parliament: that a strict compliance with this clause was at first exacted by the crown, and paid by the clergy; but

that they soon found ways of being released from the rigor of it, and prevailed upon the king to accept of their former manner of assembling with the Parliament in two provincial synods, in lieu of that closer attendance which the *præmunientes* challenged; the forms, however, being still kept up, by which the king's right of summoning them immediately to Parliament was declared all along, and their obligation to obey his summons in the way it prescribed, was duly acknowledged. That these provincial assemblies, though held apart from the Parliament, yet belonged to it; met by the parliamentary, no less than the provincial writ, and were state-meetings as well as church synods: in them parliamentary matters were transacted, and parliamentary forms and methods observed; the members of them were entitled to parliamentary wages, and enjoyed parliamentary privileges. That the inferior clergy, though divided in place from the lower laity, yet joined with them often in the same acts and petitions, and were still esteemed and called the *commons spiritual* of the realm; and what they and the prelates in convocation did, was long after the separation spoken of in our records, as done in Parliament. That these parliamentary conventions of the clergy were held at first near the time at which the laity met; afterwards with a latitude: but that this irregularity was reformed before the Reformation of religion, and their meeting and departing fixed within a day of the assembling and dismissal of the Parliament, and that this custom has now for above an age and a half continued: that for so long, therefore (not to say how much longer), the convocation has been a word of art, which signifies a meeting of the clergy in time of Parliament: that such meetings have by all that understood our constitution been held *necessary*.

"The result of all is this, that, if some hundred years custom can make a law, then may we, without offence, affirm it to be law, that the convocation should sit with every new Parliament; if the true notion of a convocation be, that it is an assembly of the clergy always attending the Parliament, then is it no presumption to say, that we have the same law for the sitting of a convocation as we have for that of a Parliament."

Such was the condition in which the convocation stood until the reign of Henry VIII. During which, in consequence of the clergy having submitted to Cardinal Wolsey, in his legatine character, they incurred the displeasure of the sovereign to such a degree, that they were all involved in a *premunire*, and were not pardoned for their offence until they had paid a large sum to the crown, and had further acknowledged, in convocation, that the convocations of the clergy "are, always have been, and ought to be, assembled by the king's writ," and "promised in *verbo sacerdotil*," that they would not from henceforth make canons without the royal assent and license. This submission was embodied in an Act of Parliament passed in the 25th year of Henry VIII. But although the clergy were restrained by this act from making canons without the consent of the crown, it

appears that full liberty was left to them, to deliberate in convocation upon other matters connected with the church, to petition the crown with respect to alleged grievances, and even to petition that new canons might be made, and to suggest the manner in which these might be framed, and also to examine and censure heretical writings.

Perhaps it may be asked, why, if this assembly possesses such powers and privileges, does it remain at the present day scarcely more than a dead letter? We will endeavour to explain the reason, after first stating the mode in which the convocation is now summoned, and of whom it consists. The convocation, as our readers are perhaps aware, is still summoned with every new Parliament, and this is done in the following mode: the king's writ is directed to the archbishop of each province, requiring him to summon all bishops, deans, archdeacons, cathedral and collegiate churches, &c. upon which the archbishop directs his mandate to his dean provincial, first citing him peremptorily, then willing him in like manner, to cite all the bishops, deans, &c. and all the clergy of his province, but directing at the same time, that one proctor sent from each cathedral and collegiate church, and two from the body of the inferior clergy of each diocese, may suffice. The upper house in the province of Canterbury consists of the bishops of the province, with the archbishop as president, who prorogues and dissolves the convocation by mandate from the crown. The lower house consists (at least before the late alterations in the dioceses, and we are not aware that any change has been made by them) of twenty-two deans, fifty-four archdeacons, twenty-four proctors from the chapters, and forty-four proctors representing the parochial clergy. Each house has a prolocutor, chosen from among themselves. All members of both houses possess the same privilege of freedom from arrest as members of parliament, by 8th of Henry VI. In the province of York the convocation consists only of one house, and each archdeaconry elects two proctors.

The convocation continued not only to meet, but also to deliberate, so late as the year 1717. In that year the proceedings of this assembly turned upon two works by Bishop Hoadley, one of which was entitled *A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-jurors*; and the other, a sermon, called, *The Nature of the Kingdom of Christ*. The convocation appointed a committee to examine these two performances, and thus commenced the celebrated Bangorian controversy, in the course of which William Law published his justly famous three Letters to Hoadley, which should be read and studied by every churchman. The convocation drew up a representation, in which

the "Preservative" and the "Sermon" were censured, as tending to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, to reduce his kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion, to impugn and impeach the royal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanctions. Before, however, this representation could be brought into the upper house, the whole assembly was prorogued by a special order from the king. From that period to the present, the convocation has never transacted any business, but after meeting with each new Parliament, and going through certain forms, has adjourned *sine die*.

That the party at present in power in this country should not wish this assembly to sit and deliberate, is not perhaps surprising, when we observe them on every occasion so desirous to lower the persons of whom this assembly would consist in the estimation of the public, to deprive them of their rights and privileges, to harass and annoy them by vexatious measures, and to insult their feelings and sympathies as a class, through the medium of their organs of the press. But that, in the period intervening from the time when this assembly last transacted business until the present day, during which that sound and constitutional party which is at once friendly to the rights and authority of the crown and the privileges of the Church has been so frequently in power, the convocation should never have been encouraged to act in its proper character as the representative of the Church, we own, does excite some astonishment in our minds. However, we are not to suppose that this conduct proceeded from any unfriendly feelings. It was caused most probably by an ignorance or misapprehension of the real nature and powers of such an assembly, by an unconsciousness of the wants and necessities of the Church requiring its sitting, or else perhaps by an expectation, that those who were most interested ought to be the first to urge such a subject. Meanwhile, the Church has suffered, and is still suffering, from the want of such a public organ for the expression of its opinion on matters of faith and discipline, and on those questions where its temporal possessions and privileges are at issue. Deprived continually of some right or immunity, hemmed in by harrassing and vexatious restrictions invented only to gratify the malice of her foes, she has no persons immediately interested in pleading her cause and in guarding her welfare, except her prelates; whilst those of the laity, who, when they need her aid, scruple not to court her ministers, and to overwhelm them with professions of zeal and veneration for her cause, when the hour of trial arrives, either stand by with

a cold and heartless indifference, when matters involving her institutions in the most imminent hazard are being agitated; or else, to their shame be it spoken, are not unwilling to lend their aid to her enemies for reasons of expediency forsooth! As if expediency—that most pernicious of all rules of human action—should be the standard by which those who profess a regard for religion should permit themselves to be guided! Yes! it is very lamentable, but not the less true, we fear, that certain men, who are eager to avow their friendship for the Church on many occasions, consider her, at least if we are to judge by their conduct, as a mere engine of state policy, a sort of political shuttlecock, which is to be bandied about by them exactly in that manner which may best promote their own interests.

ART. IV.—*The Works of Bishop Hall.* Oxford: Talboys.

SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH distinguished three great periods and divisions in the character and history of English style: the first extending from Sir Thomas More to Lord Clarendon; the second from the restoration to the middle of the eighteenth century; the third, which he called the Rhetorical, and which has derived a peculiar physiognomy, from the prevalence of the Johnsonian school of writers. An uncertainty and variety of opinion has long prevailed, respecting the formation and progress of our Prose, which has never attached to the history of our Poetry. Every eye turns, without hesitation, to the morning star of Chaucer; the luminous genius of Shakespeare; the richly-coloured visions of Beaumont or of Marlowe; and the resplendent learning of Milton. These names are the lights that guide the critic's footsteps through the paths of our earlier literature. He beholds the torch of allegory transmitted, in succession, from the hand of Spenser to Fletcher and Henry More: sees it rekindled by the breath of Thomson and Beattie. The advance of the Drama is marked in his investigations by circumstances of equal precision, the rude Morality or Miracle Play glimmers, by faint degrees, into the dawn of legitimate invention; and the Castle of Perseverance and the Cradle of Security* brighten at length into *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, or *Romeo and Juliet*.

Burnet pronounced Bacon the first correct writer of our language, "and considered him our best author;" even after the

* See Collier's *History of Dramatic Poetry*.

appearance of the prefaces of Dryden and the essays of Cowley ; Hume, on the contrary, attributed the earliest specimen of polite prose to Swift, and discovered in Bacon, Milton, and Harrington, only stiffness and pedantry. If style be understood to express merely the flow and modulation of sentences, to bear the same relation to prose which rhyme bears to poetry, Bacon cannot be called a correct writer. The sweet falling of the clauses, to borrow a phrase of his own, seems never to have engaged his attention ; and his metrical attempts in psalmody, display a perfect ignorance of musical adaptations. But the mind of Bacon was essentially poetical, and, like Sir Thomas Browne, to whom he had some intellectual resemblance, his imagination often speaks, as it were unconsciously, in a voice of melody. He loved the harmony of soft instruments, and the perfume of flowers, and the song of birds ; Philosophy always appeared to him, like Citherea, attired by the graces, and carrying the Paphian girdle in her bosom. Ben Jonson, in his Discoveries, has some valuable remarks upon the progress of eloquence in *England* :

“ We have had (he writes) many, and in their several ages, ‘to take in but the former *seculum* ;’ Sir Thomas More, the elder Wiat, Henry Earl of Surrey, Chaloner, Smith, Eliot, B. Gardiner, were for their times admirable ; and the more, because they began eloquence with us. Sir Nicholas Bacon was singular, and almost alone, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s time ; Sir Phillip Sydney and Mr. Hooker (in different matter) grew great masters of wit and language, and in whom all vigour of invention and strength of judgment met. The Earl of Essex, noble and high, and Sir Walter Raleigh, not to be contemned, either for judgment or style ; Sir Henry Saville, grave and truly lettered ; Sir Edwin Sandys excellent in both ; Lord Egerton, the Chancellor, a grave and great orator, and best when he was provoked. But his learned and able (though unfortunate) successor, is he who hath filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome ; in short, within his view, and about his times, were all the wits born that could honour a language or help study. Now things daily fall, wits grow downward, and eloquence grows backward, so that he may be named and stand as the mark and ἀκμή of our language.”

The unfortunate successor of Egerton, we need hardly say, was Lord Bacon. The formation of language, viewed in relation to the general refinement of European literature, has been treated by Mr. Hare with a skill and elegance which will excuse the length of the quotation—

“ There are three genial and generative periods in the history of language.

“ The first, and far the most important, is that in which the great

elementary processes are gone through ; when the laws and forms of the language are determined, and the body of the national thoughts, whether arising out of the depths of its own character, or awakened by the objects around it, fashion and find their appropriate utterance. This is a period of which little notice can be preserved. We are seldom able to watch the processes while they are working. In a primitive homogeneous language, that working is over before it comes forward in a substantial permanent shape, and takes its seat in the halls of literature : and even in a composite language, like our own, arising out of the confluence and fusion of two, we have scanty means for observing their mutual action upon each other. We see them flowing for a while side by side : then both vanish, like the Rhine at Laufenburg : and anon the mingled streams start into sight again, though perhaps not quite thoroughly blended, but each in a manner preserving a distinct current for a time, as the Rhine and Saone do at their junction. In this stage, a language is rich in expressions for outward objects, and for simple feelings and actions, but contains few abstract terms, and not many compound words, except such as denote obvious combinations of frequent occurrence. The laws and principles of such compositions, however, are already established : and here and there instances are found of the simplest abstract terms ; after the analogy of which others are subsequently framed, according to the growing demands of reflection. Such is the state of our own language, in the age of Chaucer : such is that of the German, in the *Nibelungen-Lay* ; and that of the Greek in Hesiod and in Homer ; in the latter of whom, however, we already hear the snorting of the horses that are drawing on the car of Apollo, and see the sparks that flash up beneath their feet as they rush along the pavement of heaven.

“ Thus far a language has very little that is arbitrary in it—very little betokening the conscious power and action of man. It owes its origin, not to the thoughts and the wills of individuals, but to an instinct actuating a whole people : it expresses what is common to them all ; it has grown out of their universal wants, and lives in their hearts. But after a while an intellectual aristocracy spring up, and frame a new language of their own. The princes and lords of thought shoot forth their winged words into regions beyond the scan of the people. They require a gold coinage, in addition to the common currency. The imagination, finding out its powers and its office, and feeling its freedom, begins to fashion, and mould, and combine things according to its own laws. It is no longer content to reflect the outward world and its forms just as it has received them, with such modifications and associations alone as have been bestowed on them in the national mythology : it seizes the elements, both of outward nature and of human, and mixes them up in its crucible, and bakes them anew in its furnace : it discerns within itself, that there are other shapes and visions of grandeur and beauty, besides those that roll before the eyes—that there are other sympathies and deeper harmonies and discord ; and for this its new creation it endeavours to devise fitting symbols in words. ”

“ This is the age of genial power in poetry, and of a luxuriant richness in language : the age of Eschylus and Aristophanes ; the age of

Ennius and Lucretius, who, however, must be measured by the Roman scale; the age of Shakespeare and Milton. It may be termed the heroic age of language, coming after its golden age, during which, from the unbroken unity of life, there was no call or room for heroes. Custom has not yet marked out the limits within which the plastic powers of the language must be restrained: and they who feel their own strength, and that of their weapon, fancy there is nothing they may not achieve with it. Of the new words formed in this age, many find an echo long after amid the heights of literature: some are so peculiar, they can fit no place except the one they were made for: many fall to the ground and are forgotten when the scythe of summer mows off the rich bloom of spring.

“The third great period in the history of a language, is the period of its development as an instrument of reason and reflection. This is the age of verbal substantives and of abstract derivatives from adjectives, formed in a homogeneous language, after the analogy of earlier examples, but multiplied far beyond what had sufficed for a simpler, less speculative generation. The dawn of this age we see struggling through the darkness in Thucydides; the difficulties of whose style arise, in great measure, from his efforts to express thoughts so profound and far-stretching in a language scarcely adapted as yet to such purposes. For, though, potentially, it had an indefinite wealth in general terms, that wealth was still lying for the most part in the mind: and the simple—epical accumulations of sentences, by means of connective particles, was only beginning to give way to a compacter, more logical structure, by the particles of casuality and modality. In England, as indeed throughout the whole of modern Europe, the order assigned by nature for the successive unfolding of the various intellectual powers, in nations as well as individuals,—an order which, unless disturbed by extraneous causes, would needs be much more perceptible, as all general laws are more aggregate than in a single unit,—was, in some degree, altered by the influx of the traditional knowledge amass by former ages.

“That knowledge, acting more powerfully, and with more certain benefit, on the reasoning faculties than on the imaginative, accelerated the growth of the former, and brought them to an earlier maturity; a result owing mainly to the existence of a large class, who, being the chief depositaries of knowledge, were especially led by their profession, and by the critical and striving circumstances of the times, to a diligent pursuit of all studies concerning the moral and spiritual nature of man. Hence the philosophical cultivation of our own language coincided with its poetical cultivation: and this prematurity was the more easily attainable, in as much as the mass of our philosophical words were not of home growth, but imported ready grown from abroad; so that, like oranges, they might be in season along with primroses and violets. Yet the natural order was so far upheld, that while the great age of our own poetry is comprised in the last quarter of the sixteenth and the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the great age of our philosophy and theology reaches down till near the close of the latter. Milton stands alone, and forms a link between the two.”

Lowth, in the preface to his Grammar, expresses an opinion that in correctness, propriety, and purity, Hooker has never been surpassed, or even equalled by any of his contemporaries—a decision, which Dugald Stewart, as we think, justly considered to be unsupported in all its extent. Hooker enriched our language, but he had the cumbrous gait and the rough aspect of a pioneer. But to praise Hooker for his style, is like commending an orator for the softness of his tones. It is in the dignity of his subjects, the weight of his matter, the rigid accuracy of his inductions, the profound simplicity of his opinions, and the general skill of his analytical powers, that his true and distinguishing merits reside. Taylor left him at an immeasurable distance in all the charms of imagination; and Barrow, in the illuminating decorations of argument; and Hall, in the sweetness and colour of his thoughts; and Hammond, in the seraphical ardour of his spiritual aspirations. But Hooker equalled, perhaps he excelled, them all, in the muscular energy with which he worked his way through the entanglement of an investigation. It was his lot to be engaged during a considerable portion of his life in asserting and defending his own opinions. To his controversy with Travers, we owe the Ecclesiastical Polity. His path lay over the most perilous precipices, in which he had often to cut a place for his feet, violent and courageous adversaries constantly hanging upon his steps, and ready to avail themselves of the slightest error to accomplish his overthrow and destruction. The sense of his danger quickened his caution: he appears, to continue the metaphor, never to advance an inch without being satisfied of the safety of his position—he never leaps by a sudden and exhausting effort to some elevated point, and then abandons the enterprise; but leaning upon that staff of divine faith which scripture supplies, and shod with the preparation of the gospel, and strengthened and supported by the most extensive erudition and the deepest meditation, he proceeds upon his course triumphantly. He has the ease and tranquillity of conscious strength. James the First gave him the appellation of “venerable and judicious Hooker,” by which posterity has delighted to honour him. The student of our sacred literature turns to his works as to some mighty and ponderous rampart, against which the audacity of the scorner and the pride of infidelity have been dashed in pieces, like the affrighted enemy before some massy and frowning castle of our warlike ancestors.

Mr. Crowe, in his treatise on *English Versification*, discovers a resemblance to the figure of alliteration in our modern writers; in those sentences, for example, where the words of one part have their correspondent words in the other, both in sense and

order, as in the following passage 'in Johnson's *Life of Gray*, where he speaks of "a zeal of admiration, which cannot be expected from the neutrality of a stranger, or the coldness of a critic;" a construction regarded by Crowe as very far removed from a dignified simplicity: the words (he says) would have been arranged differently two hundred years ago: the words neutrality and stranger, coldness and critic, would not have been set opposite each other in such formal order: he adduces an instance from Hooker's Sermon on Pride—"all which tends to beat down pride, whether it be advertisement from men, or chastisement from God himself." These are the words, but not the arrangement of Hooker, who wrote "whether it be advertisement from men, or from God himself chastisement;" so that the correspondent phrases from men, from God himself, occupy different places in the two parts of the sentence; and by that collocation, in the opinion of Crowe, impart a variety and communicate a more agreeable turn to the period. But Hooker sometimes adopted this artificial arrangement with success, as in the admirable description of Law, which has attracted the notice of many who are perfectly ignorant of the works of Hooker: it occurs in the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. "Of Law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do pay her homage; the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power. Both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." Upon which Bishop Jebb has remarked, "Hooker's view, which I admired (before I knew better) without bound, may have some foundation; but it is something better than Law, whose voice is the harmony of the world." It was perhaps in a similar spirit, that Coleridge ventured, as he said with some hesitation, to think that Hooker had been a little over credited for his judgment. But the learned Bishop of Limerick seems to have misapprehended the meaning of Hooker. Language, was the saying of a great master of the art, most shows a man: speak that I may see thee. It springs out of the most retired and innermost parts of us, and is the image of the parent of it—the mind. No glass renders a man's form or likeness so true as his speech—nay, he continues, it is likened to a man: and as we consider feature and composition in a man, so words in language; in the greatness, aptness, sound structure, and harmony of it. The remark is peculiarly applicable to Hooker, whose calm and majestic intellect is reflected in its just proportions, through his unadorned

and homely style. Sometimes he rises to a higher view, and then his diction rolls with the solemn music of Milton, as in the following illustration of the law which natural agents observe, and their necessary manner of keeping it :

“ This world’s first creation, and the preservation since of things created, what is it but only so far forth a manifestation by execution what the eternal law of God is concerning things natural ? And as it cometh to pass in a kingdom rightly ordered, that after a law is once published it presently takes effect far and wide, all states framing themselves thereunto ; even so let us think it fareth in the natural course of the world : since the time that God did first proclaim the edicts of his law upon it, heaven and earth have hearkened unto his voice, and their labour hath been to do his will : He “ made a law for the rain ”—(Job. xxviii. 26). He gave his “ decree ” unto the sea, that the water should not pass his commandment—(Jerem. v. 22.) Now if nature should intermit her course, and leave altogether, though it were but for a while, the observation of her own laws ; if those principal and mother elements of the world, whereof all things in this lower world are made, should lose the qualities which now they have ; if the frame of that heavenly arch erected over our heads should loosen and dissolve itself ; if celestial spheres should forget their wonted motions, and by irregular volubility turn themselves any way as it might happen ; if the Prince of the lights of heaven, which now, as a giant doth run his unwearied course, should, as it were, through a languishing faintness, begin to stand and to rest himself ; if the moon should wander from her beaten way, the times and seasons of the year blend themselves by disordered and confused mixture, the winds breathe out their last gasp, the clouds yield no rain, the earth be defeated of heavenly influence, the fruits of the earth pine away as children at the withered breasts of their mother, no longer able to yield them relief : what would become of man himself, whom these things now do all serve ? See we not plainly that obedience of creatures unto the law of nature is the stay of the whole world ? ”*

It does not come within the scope of this Article to analyze or characterize the Ecclesiastical Polity—that work has been performed by Mr. Keble. But it will not be uninteresting to introduce an *account* of that polemical contest which was so instrumental in occasioning its composition. A very full and interesting narrative of Hooker’s controversy with Travers has been given by Fuller, a writer, we may venture to affirm, unparalleled in the literature of the world, for capacity and acuteness of intellect, for variety and quickness of fancy, for the combination of pathos and humour, of learning and bon-mots, of simplicity and sagacity. A separation of endowments so opposed to each other might have made a complete writer, but their union composes a

* Keble’s Edition vol. i. page 257.

more extraordinary genius. Sometimes fantastic as the most volatile dreamer; sometimes vehement as the most enthusiastic orator; now laughing with the abandonment of Farce—now weeping the tenderest tears of Elegy; at one moment breathing the soul of Christian consolation, at another stringing the pearls of oriental metaphor. Some of his expressions are actual synonyms to phrases in eastern poetry, and fulfilled his own admirable definition of fancy, which he affirmed to be an inward sense of the soul, retaining and examining whatever was brought in by the common sense. It digs, he said, without spade, sails without ship, flies without wings, builds without charge, fights without bloodshed; striding in a moment from the centre to the circumference of the world, and creating and annihilating things by the motion of its magical wand. This fancy—walking the whole circle of the sciences and the arts, never weary, never asleep—belonged to Fuller. He, who had bestowed upon him so ample a genius, accompanied it with the faculty of memory to an extent enjoyed by few in any age of society. Pages passed from his eye or his ear into his mind, there to be laid up for future service. Every one has heard of his bringing home a sermon verbatim, and of his marvellous enumeration of the names and signs in Cheapside. But an anecdote more characteristic and interesting has been related of him: Happening to visit the Committee of Sequestrators, sitting at Waltham, in Essex, they began to commend his surprising memory. “’Tis true, gentlemen, replied Fuller, “that fame has given me the report of a memorist, and if you please, I will give you an experiment of it.” The Committee readily assented. “Gentlemen,” resumed Fuller, “I will give you an instance of my memory in the particular instance in which you are employed. Your worships have thought fit to sequester an honest but poor cavalier parson, my neighbour, from his living, and committed him to prison; he has a large family of children, and his circumstances are indifferent; if you will please to release him out of prison, and restore him to his living, I will never forget the kindness while I live:”

“A. D. 1591. A. R. *Eliz.* 34.

“Now began the heat and height, of the sad contest betwixt Mr. Richard Hooker, Master, and Mr. Walter Travers, Lecturer, of the Temple. We will be the larger in the relating thereof, because we behold their actions not as the deeds of private persons, but the public champions of their party. Now as an army is but a champion diffused, so a champion may be said to be an army contracted. The Prelatical party wrought to the height in and for Hooker, nor was the Presbyterian power less active in assisting Mr. Travers; both sides being glad

they had gotten two such eminent leaders with whom they might engage with such credit to their cause.

“ Hooker, was born in Devonshire, bred in Oxford, fellow of Corpus Christi College ; one of a solid judgment and great reading ; yea, such the depth of his learning, that his pen was a better bucket than his tongue to draw it out. A great defender, both by preaching and writing, of the discipline of the Church of England, yet never got (nor cared to get) any eminent dignity therein, conscience, not covetousness, engaging him in the controversy. Spotless was his conversation, and though some dirt was cast, none could stick on his reputation. Mr. Travers was brought up in Trinity College, in Cambridge ; and because much of Church matters depends upon him, I give the reader the larger account of his carriage.

“ Travers, meeting with some discontents in the College, after the death of Dr. Beomond (in whose time he was elected fellow), took occasion to travail beyond seas, and coming to Geneva, contracted familiarity with Mr. Beza and other foreign divines, with whom he by letters continued correspondence till the day of his death. Then returned he and commenced Batchelor of Divinity in Cambridge, and after that went beyond sea again, and at Antwerp was ordained Minister of the Presbytery there. * * * *

“ Thus put in orders by the Presbytery of a foreign nation, he continued there some years, preached (with Mr. Cartwright) unto the English factory of Merchants at Antwerp, until at last he came over into England, and for seven years together became Lecturer in the Temple (refusing all presentative preferment to decline subscription), and lived domestic chaplain in the house of the Lord Treasurer Cecil, being tutor for a time to Robert his son, afterwards Earl of Sarisbury. And although there was much heaving and shuffling at him (as one disaffected to the discipline), yet God’s goodness, his friend’s greatness, and his own honesty, kept him (but with much difficulty) in his ministerial employment.

“ Yea now so great grew the credit and reputation of Mr. Travers, that (by the advice of Mr. Andrew Melvin) he and Mr. Cartwright were solemnly sent for to be Divinity Professors in the University of St. Andrew’s.

“ This proffer both jointly refused, with return of their most affectionate thanks, and such who know least are most bold in their conjectures to adventure at the reasons of their refusal ; as that they would not leave the sun on their backs, and remove so far north, or they were discouraged with the slenderness of the salary assigned unto them. In plain truth, they were loath to leave, and their friends loath to be left by them, conceiving their pains might as well be bestowed in their native country ; and Travers quietly continued Lecturer at the Temple till Mr. Hooker became the Master thereof.

“ Mr. Hooker, his voice was low, stature little, gesture none at all, standing stone still in the pulpit, as if the posture of his body were the emblem of his mind, unmoveable in his opinions ; where his eye was left fixed at the beginning, it was found fixed at the end of his sermon : in a word, the doctrine he delivered, had nothing but itself to

garnish it. His style was long and pithy, driving on a whole flock of several clauses before he came to the close of a sentence ; so that when the copiousness of his style met not with proportionable capacity in his auditors, it was unjustly censured for perplex, tedious, and obscure. His sermons followed the inclination of his studies, and were for the most part on controversy and deep points of school divinity.

“ Mr. Travers, his utterance was graceful, gesture plausible, matter profitable, method plain, and his style carried in it *indolem pietatis*, a genius of grace flowing from his sanctified heart. Some say that the congregation in the Temple ebbed in the forenoon and flowed in the afternoon, and that the auditory of Mr. Travers was far the more numerous, the first occasion of emulation betwixt them ; but such as knew Mr. Hooker, knew him to be too wise to take exceptions at such trifles, the rather because the most judicious is always the least part in all auditories.

“ Here might one on Sundays have seen almost as many writers as hearers ; not only young students, but even the gravest benchers (such as Sir Edward Cook and Sir James Altham then were) were not more exact in taking instructions from their clients, than in writing notes from the mouths of their ministers. The worst was, these two preachers, though joined in affinity (their nearest kindred being married together), acted with different principles, and clashed one against another ; so that what Mr. Hooker delivered in the forenoon, Mr. Travers confuted in the afternoon. At the building of Solomon’s Temple, I. Kings vi. 7, *neither hammer, nor axe, nor tool of iron was heard therein*. Whereas, alas ! in this *Temple*, not only much knocking was heard, but (which was the worst) the nails and pins which one master builder drove in were driven out by the other, to pass by lesser differences betwixt them about predestination.”

“ HOOKER MAINTAINED.

“ ‘ The Church of Rome, though not a pure and perfect, yet is a true Church, so that such who live upon and die therein, (being weak, ignorant, and seduced, Fuller says in the margin), their repentance of all their sins of ignorance, may be saved.’

“ TRAVERS DEFENDED.

“ ‘ The Church of Rome is no true Church at all, so that such who live and die therein, holding justification in part by works, cannot be said, by the Scriptures, to be saved.’

“ Thus much disturbance was caused to the disquieting of people’s consciences, the disgrace of the ordinance, the advantage of the common enemy, and the dishonour of God himself.

“ Here Archbishop Whitgift interposed his power, and silenced Travers from preaching either in the Temple or any where else. It was laid to his charge : 1. That he was no lawful ordained minister according to the Church of England. 2. That he preached here without license. 3. That he had broken the order (made in the seventh year of her Majesty’s reign) wherein it was provided, that erroneous doctrine, if it came to be publicly taught, should not be publicly refuted, but that notice thereof should be given to the Ordinary, to hear and determine such causes, to prevent public disturbance.

“ As for Travers, his silencing, many which were well pleased with

the deed done, were offended at the manner of doing it. For all the congregation on a Sabbath in the afternoon were assembled together, their attention prepared, their cloth (as I may say) and napkins were laid, yea the guests set, and their knives drawn for their spiritual repast, when suddenly as Mr. Travers was going up into the pulpit, a sorry fellow served him with a letter, prohibiting him to preach any more. In obedience to authority (the mild and constant submission whereunto won him respect with his adversaries), Mr. Travers calmly signified the same to the congregation, and requested them quietly to depart to their chambers. Thus was our good *Zaccheus struck dumb in the temple*, but not for infidelity! impartial people accounting his fault at most but indiscretion. Meantime, his auditory (pained that their pregnant expectation to hear him preach, should so publicly prove abortive, and sent sermonless home) manifested in their variety of passion, some grieving, some frowning, some murmuring, and the wisest sort, who held their tempers, shook their heads, as disliking the managing of the matter.

“ Travers addressed himself, by petition, to the Lords of the Privie Councill (where his strength lay, as Hooker’s in the Archbishop of Canterbury and high Commission), grievously complained that he was punished before he was heard, silenced (by him apprehended the heaviest penalty) before sent for, contrary to equity and reason. *The law condemning none before it hear him and know what he hath done.* (John vii, 51.)

“ 1. To the exception against the lawfulness of his ministry, he pleaded that the communion of saints allows ordination legal in any Christian Church, orders herein are like degrees, and a doctor graduated in any university hath his title and place granted him in all Christendom.

“ 2. For want of licence to preach, he pleaded that he was recommended to this place of the Temple by two letters of the Bishop of London, the diocesan thereof.

“ 3. His anti-preaching in the afternoon against what was delivered before; he endeavoured to excuse by the example of St. Paul, *who gave not place to Peter, no not an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue amongst them.*—(Gal ii. 5.)

“ But we are too tedious herein, especially seeing his petition is publicly extant in print, with Mr. Hooker his answer thereunto, whither we refer the reader for his more ample satisfaction.

“ By the way, it must not be forgotten, that in the very midst of the paroxism betwixt Hooker and Travers, the latter still bare (and none can challenge the other to the contrary) a reverend esteem of his adversary. And when an unworthy aspersion (some years after) was cast on Hooker, (if Christ was dasht, shall Christians escape clean in their journey to heaven), Mr. Travers, being asked of a private friend, what he thought of the truth of that accusation? *In truth*, said he, *I take Mr. Hooker to be a holy man.* A speech which, coming from an adversary, sounds no less to the commendation of his charity who spake it, than to the praise of his piety of whom it was spoken.

“ The council-table was much divided about Travers, his petition.

All Whitgift's foes were *ipso facto* made Travers favourers, besides he had a large stock of friends on his own account. But Whitgift, however, moved more in Church matters than all the hands of the privy counsellors besides, and he was content to suffer others to be believed (and perchance to believe themselves) great actors in Church-government, whilst he knew he could and did do all things himself therein. No favour must be afforded Travers on any terms. 1. Dangerous was his person, a Cartwright junior, none in England, either more loving Geneva, or more loved by it. 2. Dangerous the place, the Temple being one of the inns (therefore a publick) of court (therefore a principal) place, and to suffer one opposite to the English discipline to continue lecturer there, what was it but in effect to retain half the lawyers of England to be of council against the ecclesiastical government thereof. 3. Dangerous the precedent, this leading case would be presumed on for others to follow, and a *rank's breaking, may be an army's ruining*."—*Ch. Hist.* B. ix. p. 218. folio edit. 1655.

In his *Worthies*, Fuller gives a similar account of Hooker's preaching:—

"His style was prolix, but not tedious, and such who would patiently attend and give him credit, all the reading or hearing of his sentences, had their expectation, were paid at the close thereof. He may be said to have made good music with his fiddle and stick alone, without any rosin, having neither pronounciation nor gesture to grace his matter."

Bishop Gauden also records his "still voice and silent gesture," enforced, however, with what he justly calls the greatest virtue and efficaciousness of a preacher—"potent demonstrations of Scripture and reason"—Walton paints him very happily, as seeming "to study as he spake." James very acutely and excellently defined the eloquence of Hooker to be devoid of all affectation, and to consist of a grave, comprehensive, and clear manifestation of reason. No criticism can be more succinct and accurate. We have already admitted his inferiority to some of his most illustrious successors; but his genius was admirably adapted to the object to which, by the will of Providence, he devoted it. It was his office to build up and repair the edifice of Christian doctrine; not to array or to embellish it. Not oft

"before his infant eyes would run
Such forms as glitter in the muse's ray,
With orient hues unborrow'd of the sun."

Like Taylor, he was a controversialist; but there was no external resemblance between these mighty soldiers of the Cross. One descended into the arena in the costliest panoply of erudition, glittering with the gathered ornaments of time, and beautifully terrible with the weapons of reason and the blaze of imagination, not less than in the armour of truth, and with the helmet of salvation; the other advanced to meet the ad-

versary, arrayed in the homeliest and simplest apparel—but the giant trembled before this shepherd of Israel, coming forth to battle with a sling and with a stone. The sermons of Hooker are strictly argumentative; they prove, rather than exhort; and confirm, rather than illustrate. His famous discourse upon Justification has, probably, no complete parallel in our theological literature, for vigour, depth, tranquillity, and compression. He presents the most abstruse problems to the sight and understanding of the reader in terms at once the most luminous and the most conclusive. Take the following specimen:—

“Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him, God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Him. Then, although, in ourselves, we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet, even the man which is in himself impious, full of iniquity, full of sin, him being found in Christ through faith, and leaving his sin in hatred through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded him in the law: shall I say more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say: but the Apostle saith, ‘God made Him which knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.’ Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself. Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered; that God hath made himself the sin of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God.”

And again, upon the same great doctrine:—

“The enemy that waiteth for all occasions to work our ruin hath ever found it harder to overthrow an humble sinner than a proud saint. There is no man’s case so dangerous as his whom Satan hath persuaded that his own righteousness shall present him pure and blameless in the sight of God. If we could say, ‘we are not guilty of anything at all in our consciences, (we know ourselves far from this innocency! we cannot say, we know nothing by ourselves, but if we could), should we therefore plead not guilty in the presence of our Judge, that sees further into our hearts than we ourselves are able to do? If our hands did never offer violence to our brethren, a bloody thought doth prove us murderers before him: if we had never opened our mouths to utter any scandalous, offensive, or hurtful word, the cry of our secret cogitations is heard in the ears of God. If we did not commit the evils which we do daily and hourly, either in deeds, words, or thoughts, yet in the good things which we do, how many defects are there intermingled! God, in that which is done, respecteth especially the mind and intention of the doer. Cut off, then, all those things wherein we have regarded our own glory, those doings which we do to please men or to

satisfy our own liking, those things which we do with any by-respect, not sincerely and purely for the love of God, and a small score will serve for the number of our righteous deeds. Let the holiest and best thing we do be considered. We are never better affected unto God than when we pray; yet, when we pray, how are our affections many times distracted! How little reverence do we shew to the grand majesty of that God unto whom we speak! How little remorse of our own miseries! How little taste of the sweet influence of His tender mercies do we feel! Are we not as unwilling, many times, to begin, and as glad to make an end; as if God, in saying ‘call upon me,’ had set us a very burdensome task?

“It will seem somewhat extreme which I will speak; therefore, let every one judge of it, even as his own heart shall tell him, and no otherwise; I will but only make a demand. If God should yield to us, not as unto Abraham, if fifty, forty, thirty, twenty, yea, or if ten good persons could be found in a city, for their sakes, that city should not be destroyed; but if God should make us an offer thus large, search all the generations of men since the fall of your father, Adam, find one man which hath done one action which hath past from him pure, without any stain or blemish at all, and for that one man’s only action, neither man nor angel shall feel the torments which are prepared for both: do you think that this ransom, to deliver men and angels, would be found among the sons of men? The best things we do have somewhat in them to be pardoned. How then can we do anything meritorious and worthy to be rewarded? Indeed, God doth liberally promise whatsoever appertaineth to a blessed life, unto as many as sincerely keep his law, though they be not exactly able to keep it. Wherefore we acknowledge a dutiful necessity of doing well, but the meritorious dignity of doing well we utterly renounce. We know how far we are from the perfect righteousness of the law; the little fruit we have in holiness, it is, God knoweth, corrupt and unsound: we put no confidence at all in it, we challenge nothing in the world for it, we dare not call God to a reckoning, as if we had him in our debt-books: our continual suit to him is, and must be, to bear with our infirmities, to pardon our offences!”

His sermon on the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect, is animated by a spirit of glowing devotion and lofty enthusiasm. The preacher’s heart kindles as he speaks:

“It was not the meaning of our Lord and Saviour, in saying, ‘Father, keep them in thy name,’ that we should be careless to keep ourselves. To our own safety, our own sedulity is required: and then blessed for ever be that mother’s child whose faith hath made him the child of God. The earth may shake, the pillars of the world may tremble under us, the countenance of the heavens may be appalled, the sun may lose his light, the moon her beauty, the stars their glory, but concerning the man that trusteth in God, if the fire once proclaimed itself unable as much to singe a hair of his head; if lions, beasts ravenous by nature and keen with hunger, being set to devour,

have, as it were, religiously adored the very flesh of the faithful man ; what is there in the world that shall change his heart, overthrow his faith, alter his affection towards God, or the affection of God to him ? If I be of this note, who shall make a separation between me and my God ? ‘ Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword ? ’ No. ‘ I am persuaded that neither tribulation, nor anguish, nor persecution, nor famine, nor nakedness, nor peril, nor sword, nor death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, ’ shall ever prevail so far over me. ‘ I know in whom I have believed : ’ I am not ignorant whose precious blood hath been shed for me ; I have a Shepherd, full of kindness, full of care, and full of power : unto Him I commit myself ; His own finger hath engraven this sentence in the tables of my heart, ‘ Satan hath desired to winnow thee as wheat, but I have prayed that thy faith fail not ; ’ therefore the assurance of my hope I will labour to keep as a jewel, unto the end ; and by labour, through the gracious mediation of His prayer, I shall keep it.”

The influence of Hooker was visible not only upon the popular mind, and upon the character of our theological literature, but far more powerfully, and with infinitely greater advantage upon the rising school of divines. It is not as the purifier of our language, as the spring from which Raleigh drew some of his genuine and forcible diction, that we delight to contemplate the author of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, so much as the nursing father of a Hammond and a Sanderson. Mr. Keble has observed, that Hooker had his full share in training up that admirable society of men—for their minds seem to have been bound to each other by a mutual relationship—by whose learning and piety, the pillars and foundations of the Church of England, under the grace of God, have been cemented and strengthened. The character of Hammond shines with uncommon loveliness. Burnet said that his death was an unspeakable loss to the Church. The extent of his learning, the moderation of his character, the steadfastness of his principles—all contributed to fit him for that elevated station for which he was designed. Dr. Fell declared that his closet was his library, and that he studied most upon his knees. Charles the First called him the most natural orator he had ever heard. It is amusing to find such a writer rapidly characterised by Mr. Croker, in a note to his edition of *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, as a voluminous author, chiefly remembered for his commentary on the New Testament. But the fame of this admirable scholar and Christian lives in his sermons, which may be looked upon as undisguised revelations of his inmost feelings. The style of Hammond, like that of Cowley, has a charm of its own—an air of sincerity and meek-

ness pervades all he wrote. His religion had the strictness of the ascetic, without his gloom : and the passion of the enthusiast, without his blindness—while he was fervent, he was temperate ; when his piety was the most glowing, then his judgment was the most severe. He recommended to others the duty, and practiced it himself, of obtaining some friendly supervision of our conduct ; and when many days passed by without a reproof, he began to apprehend too much tenderness on the part of his monitor :

“ He that is overtaken in a fault (he said), if there be not some good Samaritan near, to have pity on him, to pour soft but healing oil into his wounds, and so to bind up and restore him again, may unhappily lie so long in his sin, that there be no more life in him ; the repulsed grace of Christ, in this case, constantly withdrawing itself, and not ordinarily returning again to those noisome dwellings which once so grieved and banished him out of their coasts.”

The placidity of his temper breathed a beauty, beyond the reach of art, over his compositions. His mind, to borrow an image from Ben Jonson, was always in tune, and his elocution does not jar.

The conclusion of his sermon, *The New Creature*, is admirable in spirit, poetical in illustration, and exquisite in expression :

“ And then, if thou wilt not live heartless for ever, if ever thou meanest to move, or walk, or do any thing, you must pray to that Creator of spirits and lover of souls, and never leave soliciting till he hath breathed another breath into your nostrils, another soul into your soul : you must lay yourself at his feet, and with all the violence, and rhetoric, and humility, that these wants will prompt thee to, and woo and importune the Holy Spirit to overshadow thee, to conceive all holy graces spiritually in thee ; and if thou canst not suddenly receive a gracious answer, that the Holy Ghost will come in unto thee, and lodge with thee this night, yet learn so much patience from thy beggarly estate as not to challenge him at thy own times, but comfortably to wait his leisure. There is employment enough for thee in the while to prepare the room against his coming, to make use of all his common graces to cleanse and reform thy foul corruptions, that when the Spirit comes it may find thee swept and garnished. All the outward means which God hath afforded thee, he commands thee to make use of, and will require it at thy hands in the best measure, even before thou art regenerate. Though thou sin in all thy unregenerate performances, for want of inward sanctity, yet it is better to have obeyed imperfectly than not at all : the first is weakness, the other desperate presumption : the first partial obedience, the second total disobedience. Yet whilst thou art preparing, give not over praying, they are acts very compatible ; thou mayest do them both together. Whilst thou art fortifying these little kingdoms within thee, send these ambassadors abroad for help,

that thou mayest be capable of it when it comes. But above all things be circumspect, watch and observe the Spirit, and be perpetually ready to receive its blasts. Let it never have breathed on thee in vain ; let thine ear be for ever open to its whisperings : if it should pass by thee either not heard, or not understood, it were a loss that all the treasures upon earth could not repair, and for the most part you know it comes not in the thunder. Christ seldom speaks so loud now-a-days as he did to Saul. It is in a soft still voice ; and I will not promise you that men that dwell in a mill, that are perpetually engaged in worldly loud employments, or that men asleep, shall ever come to hear of it.

“ The sum of all my exhortations is after examination, to cleanse, and pray, and watch ; carefully to cleanse thyself, incessantly to pray, and diligently to watch for the Sun of Righteousness, when he shall begin to dawn, and rise and shine in thy heart by grace. And do thou, O Holy Lord, work this whole work in us, prepare us by thy outward, perfect us by thy inward graces : awaken us out of the darkness of death, and plant a new seed of holy light and life in us : infuse into heathen hearts a Christian habit of sanctity, that we may perform all spiritual duties of holiness, that we may glorify thee here by thy Spirit, and be glorified with thee by thy Christ hereafter.”—(1 Acts ix.)

If we were to compare Hammond to any of our divines, it would be to Archbishop Leighton, whom Coleridge was accustomed to place immediately after the inspired writers, and whom Burnet called an apostolical and an angelical man, unto whom, during many years, he had looked up as a father and a guide. His theological learning, and, above all, his deep intimacy with the spiritual meaning of Scripture, are familiar to every one acquainted with the Commentary upon St. Peter. The gentleness and patience of his character approach the standard of primitive piety ; during an intimacy of twenty-two years, Burnet observed only one outbreak of passion ; the solemn and benignant gravity of his manner became one who was said to be in a constant meditation. His preaching, we are informed by Burnet, had a sublimity, both of thought and expression in it ; and he adds that such was the grace of his pronunciation, and the majesty and beauty of his style, that after a lapse of thirty years, his sermons continued vividly impressed upon his memory.* The death of this master in Israel corresponded to the purity and simplicity of his life : age had laid so light a hand upon him, that when Burnet saw him shortly before his final illness, his hair was still black and his motions lively ; his mind retained its vivacity ; his memory its strength ; and his devotion its ardour. The beautiful passage out of Cicero, which Burke applied to Johnson, illustrates with equal felicity, the old age of Leighton. *Intentum nam animum quasi arcum habebat nec languescens suc-*

* History of his own Times, fol. 134.

cumbebat senectuti. Swift said, in his bitter way, that Burnet killed him by bringing him up to London. It was at the request of that prelate that Leighton visited the metropolis to see Lord Perth; looking so fresh and vigorous, that time, it was remarked, seemed to stand still with him. But the next day speech and sense deserted him, and he continued, we are told, panting twelve hours, and then expired without a struggle. He went to his reward in the full vigour of his powers.

The busy day, the peaceful night,
Unfelt, uncounted, glided by;
His frame was firm, his powers were bright,
Though now his eightieth year was nigh.

A singular circumstance is related of his death: he had been often heard to remark, that if he were to choose a place to die in, it should be an inn; because it looked like a pilgrim going home, in whose eyes the world resembled an inn, and who was weary of the noise and confusion in it; he also considered the attendance and solicitude of friends an entanglement upon the dying man. His closing hours seemed to realize his desire; he died at the Bell Inn, Warwick-lane.* It might have been wished that Burnet had fulfilled the intention he once entertained, of writing the life of his illustrious friend; of such a man nothing should be lost; every crumb from his table ought to be gathered up. Burnet thought that the style of his discourses was rather too fine; but an inexpressible sweetness and fragrancy rise from the thoughts. His imagination was "like a field which the sun has blessed." Many of his most beautiful sentiments have been transplanted by Coleridge into his *Aids to Reflection*, of which they form the principal ornament.

Should any modern Plutarch embody Mr. D'Israeli's conception of a series of Literary Parallels, we would recommend him to devote a chapter to Hammond, Leighton, and South. The mild and melting countenances of the two first, contrasted with the stern and angry physiognomy of the third, would compose an admirable example of light and shade. In Leighton and Hammond anger always seems melting into tears and compassion; in South it breaks forth with all the virulence of the political satirist. His hatred of the Puritans was intense and unremitting; Johnson, who professed to admire a good hater, must have loved him for the enthusiasm of his abhorrence. Many of

* Leighton, as we learn from Burnet, thought the great and fatal error of the Reformation, consisted in the neglect to preserve more religious houses, free from the entanglements of vows and other mixtures, for men of mortified tempers to retire to.

his sermons were directly aimed against their tenets and characters, and scarcely any one is entirely free from attack ; he steps aside from the most momentous arguments to launch an arrow against these zealots for mortification, a fervent elevation of the eye, and a devout rage against the sins of other men. Genius could not mollify his wrath, nor successful daring crush it, nor misfortune soften it into pity. Milton is the blind adder who spit venom on the king's person ; Cromwell is "Baal," "a bankrupt beggarly fellow, who entered the Parliament-house with a threadbare torn coat, a greasy hat, perhaps, neither of them paid for." Sir Harry Vane is "that worthy knight who was executed on Tower-hill." He never paints a Papist or Independent except in the blackest colours, and in the most hideous attitudes of moral deformity ; if he sometimes lets in a gleam of light, it is only to throw into stronger relief the repulsive features of the portrait. The prayers of the fanatics, the audacity of their expression, the twang of their delivery, the endless torrent of their phraseology, are successively uplifted to scorn and contempt. A passage, peculiarly illustrative of his caustic manner, occurs in his admirable Discourse upon 1 Cor. xii. 4 : "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." He has been speaking of the asserted opposition of Learning to Grace :

"Among those (he says) of the late reforming age, all learning was utterly cried down. So that with them the best preachers were such as could not read, and the ablest divines such as could not write. In all their preachments, they so highly pretended to the Spirit, that they could hardly so much as spell the letter. To be blind was with them the proper qualification of a spiritual guide ; and to be book-learned (as they called it) and to be irreligious, were almost terms convertible. None were thought fit for the ministry but tradesmen and mechanics, because none else were allowed to have the Spirit. Those only were accounted like St. Paul who could work with their hands, and in a literal sense, drive the nail home, and make a pulpit before they preached in it."

In dwelling, in a former article, upon the pictorial character of Jeremy Taylor, and endeavouring to exemplify his felicitous art of representing vividly to the reader's apprehension the object described, and of illuminating by a single epithet the entire representation, we were only illustrating the peculiar characteristic of the highest order of Imaginative Genius—in all ages of literature. Every one upon whom the Muses have breathed the purple light of their undying youth, has been eminently distinguished by this faculty—whether we go back to that poet who wandered along the sounding beach of Scio ; or to him who has consecrated to fame the name of Mantua ; or to the festive lyrist of the Sabine farm, or to the liveliest painter of Mythology. Whether we prefer to linger among the solemn visions

of Sir Thomas Brown, or to sun our fancy, so to speak, in the rich gardens of Bacon's quaint, but glowing inventions, our investigation will be rewarded, and our minds refreshed, in a similar manner; above all, our poets have enriched the language with an abundant store of exquisite epithets; Shakespeare showered them, as Titian rained the brilliant colours from his life-giving pencil. The "silver-sanded" shore, and the "myrrh-breathing zephyr" of Drayton; the "opal-coloured morn" of Sylvester; the beautiful and countless figures in Milton; and in the poetical school of the Elizabethan age will arise to every memory. Spenser, in particular, glows all over with this raiment of the fancy. Pope pronounced the compound words of Homer to be supernumerary pictures of the persons or things to which they are united; whether the plume of Hector tosses in *κερυνθαιαλος*, or the trees upon Mount Neritus wave in *εινοσιφονλλος*. His criticism of the Iliad may be transferred to the Fairy Queen, for whose embellishment and delight all the chambers of the imagination seem to have been exhausted. But to return to the more immediate subject of our present inquiry. The names of Taylor and Hall have been associated in the history of sacred eloquence, as those of Homer and Virgil in the History of Poetry; but, as Chateaubriand observes of Tasso, that his ideas were not of so beautiful a family as those of Virgil, so we may say of Hall, that he shines with a lustre far inferior to his illustrious contemporary. His divine colloquies seem to have inspired equal awe and solemnity in his heart, but to have diffused a fainter glory over his countenance. He occupies, in some respects, the same situation with respect to Taylor, as that in which we viewed Cowley in relation to Spenser. In extending and enforcing this comparison, we are driven into a definition of imagination and fancy. Mr. Nelson Coleridge, in his very agreeable Introduction to the study of the Classic Poets, has endeavoured to illustrate the distinction between these qualities of the invention, by contrasting a passage from *Romeo and Juliet* with another from the tragedy of *Lear*; and as the settlement of the question has been justly considered important in a metaphysical, not less than in a poetical sense, we will place his argument before the reader:—

O, then, I see Queen Mab has
 been with you.
She is the fairies' midwife; and she
 comes
In shape no bigger than an agate-
 stone
On the fore-finger of an alderman,
Drawn with a team of little atomies

Kent. Will you lie down and rest
 upon the cushions?

Lear. I'll see their trial first.
 Bring in the evidence. [place,
Thou robed man of justice take my
And thou, his yoke-fellow of equity
Bench by his side. You are of the
 commission,

Athwart men's noses as they lie
asleep ;
Her waggon-spokes made of long
spinners' legs ;
The cover, of the wings of grass-
hoppers ;
The traces, of the smallest spider's-
web ;
The collars, of the moonshine's
wat'ry beams ;
Her whip, of cricket's bone ; the
lash, of film ;
Her waggoner, a small gray-coated
gnat,
Not half so big as a round little
worm
Prick'd from the lazy finger of a
maid ;
Her chariot is an empty hazel-nut,
Made by the joiner squirrel, or old
grub,
Time out of mind the fairies'
coachmakers.

Rom. and Jul. act i. scene 4.

Sit you too.

Edgar. Let us deal justly.

Lear. Arraign her first ; 'tis Go-
neril ; I here take my oath before
this honourable assembly, she
kicked the poor king, her father.

Fool. Come hither, Mistress ; is
your name Goneril ?

Lear. She cannot deny it.

Fool. Cry your mercy ; I took
you for a joint-stool.

Lear. And here's another, whose
warped looks proclaim

What store her heart is made of.
Stop her there !

Arms, arms, sword, fire : corrup-
tion in the place !

False justice, why hast thou let
her'scape ?

Edgar. Bless thy fire wits !

Lear. The little dogs and all,

Tray, Blanch, and Sweetheart, see,
they bark at me.

Edgar. Tom will throw his head
to them.

Lear. Then let them anatomise
Regan :

See what bread's about her heart !
Is there any cause in nature that
makes these hard hearts ? You,
Sir,

I entertain you for one of my hun-
dred ;

Only I do not like the fashion of
your garments :

You will say they are Persian

Attire ; but let them be changed.

Lear, act iii. scene 6.

In the first of the passages, the critic supposes the images taken from objects of nature or art, to be presented *as they are* ; neither modified, nor associated, and resembling "shows passed through a magic lantern," at which we gaze without either feeling *for* or *with* them. In the second, he discovers a modification both of colour and shape, together with the quickening and pervading power of one predominant passion. "The first," he says, "is Fancy ; the last is Imagination. The one aggregates, the other associates ; that presents a spectacle, and presents it only ; this projects the man into the object, or attracts it to the

man, with a vivifying, harmonizing, impersonating energy. In a word, Fancy collects materials from the visible world, and arranges them for exhibition; but it imparts to them no touch of human interest: Imagination takes and moulds the objects of nature at the same moment; it makes them all speak the language of man, and renders them instinct with the inspired breath of human passion. In a scale of intellectual power Fancy is, indeed, a lower faculty than the Imagination, but it is also a different one from it—as different as juxta-position is from combination—as accumulation is from union.” We shall presently return to this position, which, however ingeniously taken, is not impregnable. Hurd, in a note to one of his sermons at Lincoln’s Inn, alludes to the difficulty sometimes occasioned in Scripture by a vivacity of imagination in the persuit and application of metaphors, by the sudden transit of the writer, from one idea to another, nearly or remotely allied to it—relinquishing the primary for a secondary sense. These numerous reflected lights, he says, eagerly caught at by the mind in its train of thinking, perplex the attention of a modern reader. Now this is precisely the difficulty experienced in the study of many of our elder divines. The nimbleness of their fancy and the rapidity of their apprehension confuse by the complication and variety of their evolutions and metamorphoses, and the eye is continually dazzled and frequently bewildered, by the dancing lights which start up suddenly in opposite quarters. Bishop Hall is especially open to the observation: with a richer vein of poetry than Cowley, he has much of his fantastic ingenuity, and loves to turn an image in every direction, so as to draw out every colour in the sunshine. A principal source of this perplexing fertility may be found in his intimate familiarity with all the works and all the opinions of antique literature and fiction, which he wove with infinite skill into his compositions. In that admirable letter, addressed to Lord Denny, in which he details with interesting minuteness, the employments of the day, he describes himself “meditating and winding up for future use.” The following passage from his sermon upon the Estate of a Christian (Rom. xii. 2.), will give an idea of his ingenious adaptations of ancient fables to the purposes of religious illustration and instruction. The reader who may be familiar with the picturesque and stately eloquence of Bacon will remember many passages of a kindred spirit; as in the following characteristic comparison which happens to be in our memory: “As the fable,” says Lord Bacon, “goes of the basilisk, that if he sees a man first, the man dies, but if the man see him first, the basilisk dies: so it is with frauds, impostures, and evil arts—if a man discover

them first, they lose their power of doing hurt ; but if they are not seen, they are dangerous."

Let us now go to Bishop Hall.

"Our mythologists tell us of many strange metamorphoses, of men turned into beasts, birds, trees ; wherein, doubtless, they had moral allusions. Let me tell you of a metamorphosis as strange as theirs, and as true as theirs is fabulous. They tell us of men turned into swine by vice ; I tell you of swine turned into men ; when drunkards and obscene persons turn sober and well-governed. They tell you of men turned into stones, and of stones turned into men immediately upon their deluge ; I tell you, that of very stones sons are raised up to Abraham. They tell us of a Lycaon turned into a wolf ; I tell you of a wolf turned into a man ; when a ravenous oppressor turns merciful. They tell us of men turned into oaks and rocks ; I tell you of the oak, rocky, flinty hearts of men turned into flesh, as Ezekiel speaks. They tell us of an Actæon turned into the beast which he loved to hunt, and devoured of those beasts wherewith he was wont to hunt ; I tell you of a voluptuous beast abandoning those pleasures which had wont to spend him. They tell us of a self-loving man turned into a flower ; I tell you of a fading transitory creature changed into the image of the Son of God. They tell us of a Proteus turned into all forms ; I tell you of a man of all religions, turned into a constant Confessor and Martyr for the name of Christ."

Coleridge once remarked that the present is not a logical age, and that while in the political writings of the times of Charles I. and Oliver Cromwell, the premises were frequently wrong, but the deductions generally legitimate—so in the productions of our own day, we are usually obliged to admit the soundness of the premises and the falsehood of the conclusions. And upon another occasion he observed that "the collocation of words is so artificial in Shakespeare and Milton, that you may as well think of pushing a brick out of a wall with your fore-finger as attempt to remove a word out of any of their finished passages." These observations, and especially the last, are peculiarly applicable to the theology of the seventeenth century. The severest habits of thought and analysis were combined with the most brilliant acquirements in rhetoric ; and the mind was hardened into a Spartan vigor by a bracing and vigorous discipline. The writings of Taylor, of Hall, of Barrow, and of Donne, are essentially argumentative and demonstrative. A logical precision marks every page. A specimen of this manner may be seen in a quotation from Bishop Hall's admirable discourse (sermon xxxii.) upon St. John.—"God is light"—where the logician is inflamed by the poet, and the poet restrained by the logician :—

"Away then with all dull and darksome imaginations, when we

address ourselves to the Throne of Grace ; and let us adore an Infinite Spirit, dwelling in an unaccessible light, attended with millions of angels of light and glorified spirits of his saints, in a light unspeakable and glorious. This shall be the first glimpse of our enlightened understanding, when we would comfortably appear before God. In which regard I fear many of us Christians are much defective in our holy devotions ; speaking unto God, and thinking of Him sullenly and sadly ; as shut up in some remote and unknown darkness on the other side of the world ; or, at least, without the lively apprehension of that wonderful radiance of glory wherewith he is invested ; misconceiving mercies of that Deity whom we implore, who hath revealed himself unto us by the name of light ; and surely as none but an eagle can look upon the light of the sun, so none but the confirmed eyes of our illuminated Christians can behold God in this notion of his celestial splendour, which we must so labour to attain unto and settle in our minds, as that we should no more think of the blessed Deity without the conceit of an infinite resplendency, than we can open our eyes at noon-day, without an incurrance or admission of outward light. But this, however, requisite to be conceived and done, is not the main drift of the Apostle, who goes not about here, so much to make any description of God, or prescription of the ways of our understanding, or representation of his glorious presence, as to lay the grounds of our holy disposition, and pure and heavenly carriage before him. For, so is the light here affirmed of God, as the darkness is disavowed of him, and both of them are mentioned, with an intention of drawing in an exhortation to that purity, which we should affect, and the avoidance of all the state and works of spiritual darkness which we should abhor. God then is light, as in himself ; so in relation to us : and this production of light seems to infer our conformity to God in this behalf. It is not for us, therefore, to inquire so much into those absolute terms wherein God stands with himself, as what he is in pattern unto us. Thus is he light, either qualitively or causatively. The light hath a quality (for it matters not to search into the essence of it, and, indeed, it is more than we can do to find it out) of clearness, of purity ; of clearness, for the use of manifestation ; of purity and untaintedness, in respect of any mixture of corruption. In both these is God light. Causatively, in that he is the author of all light ; communicating it to his creatures, in what kind soever ; not without reference to the diffusive quality of light in the illuminating of this vast body, and dilating itself to all the world in an instant. In these regards, therefore, is God light here : 1. Of absolute clearness, in his infinite knowledge and wisdom. 2. Of exact purity in the perfect rectitude of his will. 3. Of gracious diffusion, in the communicating of himself to his creatures and to us in special ; so, as to enlighten us with competent knowledge in our understanding, and sincere disposition of our will and affection, and, because God is thus Light, all that will claim to partake of him, must be, in their measure, clear in understanding, pure in will and affections, diffusive of their knowledge and graces to others."

Not the least curious of the many wonderful circumstances

attending the most admirable productions of the seventeenth century, is the tumult and agitation in which they were composed. It was not within the quiet gardens of a college that Taylor or Hall constructed those enduring monuments of piety and genius which they have bequeathed to the love and veneration of posterity; but when the sky was over-cast with thick darkness, and the roar of popular fury, like the rushing of a conflagration, rolled fearfully through every corner of the land; when the ear was agitated by wars and rumours of wars; when the eye was afflicted by the dissolution of the tenderest charities of life; when every man's hand was against his neighbour; when the father glared in hatred upon the son, and the son upon the father; and the "smooth shaven greens" of our hamlets were defiled with the blood of the innocent. During this stormy and tempestuous night, peace continued to sit by the hearth of these mighty masters in the faith; and a light, that deceived not, shone through their holy habitations to guide the footsteps of the wanderer amid all the desolation of that elemental warfare. That power, which belongs essentially to genius, of retiring from the world into its own reflections, and of clouding itself over with the workmanship of its own industry, protected them under all the visitations of an evil fortune; abiding, as they did, beneath the shadow of a sleepless and beneficent Providence. No enchanter in Arabian fable ever dwelt within the crystal walls of his magical palace with a serener tranquillity, than these eminent men within their sacred contemplations. Gate of pearl, or column of jasper, or chamber radiant with the gold of Ophir, never lighted up the gloom of an idolatrous temple with a richer splendour than streamed upon the souls of Hall or of Taylor from the treasures of Israel and the revelations of the Gospel. Whatever is magnificent in prophecy, or beautiful in a milder dispensation; whatever is picturesque in the pomp of ancient mythology, or charming in the notes of classic poetry—was all concentrated, like the rays of the sun, upon the great theme of their hallowed meditations.

The portrait of Taylor has been painted, and his peculiarities both of temper and of genius, as contrasted with Hall and Hooker, accurately delineated in Bishop Heber's excellent memoir prefixed to the complete edition of his works. Heber, indeed, could not have gazed long upon the moral and intellectual features of Taylor without being inspired with an affectionate reverence for one, who, in so many particulars, resembled himself. They were both endowed with the temperament of poetry, although Taylor surpassed Heber in the magnificence of his conceptions and the splendour of his imagery, as Heber, in turn,

surpassed Taylor in the graces of language, and the mechanism of verse. They were both irradiated with Scripture learning; and if Taylor's erudition was wider and deeper than that of any who have preceded or followed him, Heber possessed a liveliness and largeness of mind which enabled him to apprehend and appreciate it without labour or envy. In simplicity of manners, in amiability of life, in meekness under injury, in buoyancy of disposition, their characters harmonise; not less than in the glow of their devotion, the courage of their profession, and the ardour of their faith:

“Of Taylor's domestic habits and private character, much is not known, but all which is known is amiable. ‘Love’ as well as ‘admiration,’ is said to have waited on him in Oxford. In Wales, and amid the mutual irritation and violence of civil and religious hostility, we find him conciliating, when a prisoner, the favour of his keepers, at the same time that he preserved undiminished the confidence and esteem of his own party. Laud, in the height of his own power and full-blown dignity; Charles in his deepest reverses: Hatton, Vaughan, and Conway, amid the tumults of civil war; and Evelyn, in the tranquillity of his elegant retirement—seem alike to have cherished his friendship and coveted his society. The same genius which extorted the commendation of James, for the variety of its research and vigour of its argument, was also an object of interest and affection with the young, and rich, and beautiful Katharine Philips; and few writers who have expressed their opinions so strongly, and sometimes so unguardedly as he has done, have lived and died with so much praise and so little censure. Much of this felicity may be probably referred to an engaging appearance and a pleasing manner; but its cause must be sought, in a still greater degree, in the evident kindness of heart which, if the uniform tenour of a man's writings is any index to his character, must have distinguished him from most men living: in a temper to all appearance warm but easily conciliated, and in that which as it is one of the least common, is of all dispositions the most attractive, not merely in a neglect, but a total forgetfulness of all selfish feeling. It is this, indeed, which seems to have constituted the most striking feature of his character. Other men have been, to judge from their writings and their lives, to all appearance, as religious, as regular in their devotions, as diligent in the performance of all which the laws of God or man require from us; but with Taylor, his duty seems to have been a delight, his piety a passion. His faith was the more vivid in proportion as his fancy was more intensely vigorous; with him the objects of his hope and reverence were scarcely unseen or future; his imagination daily conducted him to ‘diet with Gods,’ and elevated him to the same height above the world, and the same nearness to ineffable things, which Milton ascribes to his allegorical ‘Cherub Contemplation.’ With a mind less accurately disciplined in the trammels and harness of the schools—less deeply imbued with ancient learning—less uniformly accustomed to compare his notions with

the dictates of elder saints and sages, and submit his novelties to the authority and censure of his superiors—such ardour of fancy might have led him into dangerous errors, or have estrayed him too far from the active duties, the practical wisdom of life, and its dull and painful realities : and, on the other hand, his logic and learning—his veneration for antiquity and precedent—and his monastic notions of obedience in matters of faith as well as doctrine—might have fettered the energies of a less ardent mind, and weighed him down into an intolerant opposer of all unaccustomed truths, and in his own practice a superstitious formalist. Happily, however, for himself and the world, Taylor was neither an enthusiast nor a bigot : and if there are some few of his doctrines from which our assent is withheld by the decisions of the Church and the language of Scripture,—even these (while in themselves they are almost altogether speculative, and such as could exercise no injurious influence on the essentials of faith or the obligations to holiness,) may be said to have a leaning to the side of piety, and to have their foundation in a love for the Deity, and a desire to vindicate his goodness, no less than to excite mankind to aspire after greater degrees of perfection.

“In the lessons which flow from this chair, in the incense which flames on this altar, the sound of worldly polemics is hushed, the light of worldly fires become dim. We see a saint in his closet, a Christian Bishop in his ministry ; and we rise from the intercourse impressed and softened with a sense how much our own practice yet needs amendment, and how mighty has been that faith of which these are the fruits, that hope of which these are the pledges and prelibations. Of the broader and more general lines of Taylor’s literary character, a very few observations may be sufficient : the greatness of his attainments and the powers of his mind, are evident in all his writings, and to the least attentive of his readers. It is hard to point out a branch of learning or of scientific pursuit to which he does not occasionally allude : or any author of eminence, either ancient or modern, with whom he does not evince himself acquainted. And it is certain, that as very few other writers have had equal riches to display, so he is apt to display his stores with a lavish exuberance, which the severer taste of Hooker or of Barrow would have condemned as ostentatious, or rejected as cumbersome. Yet he is far from a mere reporter of other men’s arguments,—a textuary of fathers and schoolmen—who resigns his reason into the hands of his predecessors, and who employs no other instrument for convincing their readers than a lengthened string of authorities. His familiarity with the stores of ancient and modern literature is employed to illustrate more frequently than to establish his positions ; and may be traced, not so much in direct citation, (though of this too, there is, perhaps, more than sufficient,) as in the abundance of his allusions, the character of his imagery, and the frequent occurrence of terms of foreign derivation, or employed in a foreign and unusual meaning.

“On the other hand, few circumstances can be named which so greatly contribute to the richness of his matter, the vivacity of his style, and the harmony of his language, as those copious drafts on all which is wise, or beautiful, or extraordinary, in ancient writers, or in foreign

tongues; and the very singularity and hazard of his phrases has not unfrequently a peculiar charm, which the observers of a tamer and more ordinary diction can never hope to inspire.

"It is on devotional and moral subjects, however, that the peculiar character of his mind is most, and most successfully, developed. To this service he devotes his most glowing language: to this his aptest illustrations: his thoughts and his words at once burst into a flame when touched by the coals of this altar; and whether he describes the duties, or dangers, or hopes of man, or the mercy, power, and justice of the Most High; whether he exhorts or instructs his brethren, or offers up his supplications in their behalf to the common Father of all—his conceptions and his expressions belong to the loftiest and most sacred description of poetry; of which they only want what they cannot be said to need, the name and the metrical arrangement.

"It is this distinctive excellence, still more than the other qualifications of learning and logical acuteness, which has placed him, even in that age of gigantic talent, on an eminence superior to any of his immediate contemporaries, which has exempted him from the comparative neglect into which the dry and repulsive learning of Andrews and Sanderson has fallen;—which has left behind the acuteness of Hales, and the imaginative and copious eloquence of Bishop Hall, at a distance hardly less than the cold elegance of Clark, and the dull good sense of Tillotson; and has seated him, by the almost unanimous estimate of posterity, on the same lofty elevation with Hooker and with Barrow.

"Of such a triumvirate, who shall settle the precedence? Yet it may, perhaps, be not far from the truth, to observe, that Hooker claims the foremost rank in sustained and classic dignity of style, in political and pragmatrical wisdom; that to Barrow the praise must be assigned of the closest and clearest views, and of a taste the most controlled and chastened; but that in imagination, in interest, in that which more properly and exclusively deserves the name of genius, Taylor is to be placed before either. The first awes most, the second convinces most, the third persuades and delights most: and (according to the decision of one whose own rank among the ornaments of English literature yet remains to be determined by posterity) Hooker is the object of our reverence, Barrow of our admiration, and Jeremy Taylor of our love."

In our next Article, the eloquence of the 18th century will lead us into the consideration of the living Masters of Pulpit Oratory.

ART. V.—*Lives of Sacred Poets.* By ROBERT ARIS WILLMOTT, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge. Published under the direction of the Committee of General Literature and Education, appointed by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Second Series. London: Parker. 1838.

HAVING, in a former volume, presented a Biographical and Critical View of English Sacred Poetry during the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I. the author proceeds, in the

present series, to complete his survey of this interesting portion of our Literature by an examination of the Poets of the latter part of the 17th, the 18th, and the beginning of the 19th centuries. The various paths, he observes, sometimes verdant and sunny, sometimes entangled and gloomy, through which the reader's footsteps have been conducted, seem to terminate before that magnificent structure which Milton consecrated to Poetry and Religion. The volume accordingly opens with a memoir of that great poet, in which the writer has given a clear and popular history of his conduct during one of the most eventful periods of our history, interspersed with running notes upon his literary productions, and illustrations of his political and poetical character. In the statement of circumstances so familiar to biography, much novelty could not be expected; but the remarks upon the writers of blank verse, who preceded Milton, seem to us ingenious and just.

If the poetry of Milton, is the observation of Johnson, be examined with regard to the pauses and flow of his verses into each other, it would appear that he has performed all that our language would admit; and the comparison of his numbers with those who have cultivated the same manner of writing, will show that he excelled as much in the lower as in the higher parts of his art, and that his skill in harmony was not less than his invention or his learning. Lord Byron, indeed, imagined that the "Paradise Lost" might have been "more nobly conveyed to posterity" in the stanza of Spenser or Tasso, or the terza-rima of Dante, and he regretted that the Seasons had not been written in rhyme. The author proceeds to review the refinement of our Poetry:

Neither Johnson, nor any other of the poet's biographers, has noticed the progress of English versification. Dr. Nott, in the dissertation prefixed to his edition of the "Remains of Surrey," seems to have established three points respecting our versification, as settled by Chaucer; first, that it was decasyllabic; secondly, that it was rhythmical; thirdly, that, like the old Alexandrine system, it admitted of redundant and defective lines. He carries his investigation rapidly over the intermediate productions of Hoccleve, Lydgate, Hawes, Barclay, and Skelton, to the appearance of the Earl of Surrey, to whom we owe the introduction of Heroick Blank Verse. Warton's conjecture, that he might have borrowed the invention from the *Italian Liberata* of Trissino, Dr. Nott refutes by an appeal to chronology. The translation of the second and fourth books of the *Æneid* are very pleasing specimens of poetic fancy, harmonizing and colouring the language. Nott quotes, with very high com-

mendation, Simon's Address to Priana, as remarkably beautiful in the artificial arrangement of the pauses, the disposition of the periods, and the pervading air of truth and innocence. The description of the Ghost of Creusa vanishing from the eyes of Æneas possesses equal merit. One or two shorter extracts will be sufficient for our purpose :

“ So shalt thou reach at last Hesperian land,
Where Lydian Tiber, with his gentle stream,
Mildly doth flow along the fruitful fields.”—B. xi. l. 103.

And again in the portrait of the disconsolate and enamoured Dido :

..... “ And when they all were gone,
And the dim moon doth oft withhold her light,
And sliding stars unto sweet sleep provoke,
Alone she mourns within her palace void,
And sits her down on her forsaken bed,
And absent him she hears.”—B. iv. l. 100.

Or in a bolder and more energetic strain :

“ With this the young men's courage did increase :
And through the dark—like to the ravening wolves,
Whom raging fury of their hungry maws
Drives from their dens—leaving with hungry throats
Their whelps behind—among our foes we ran.”—B. ii. l. 455.

In these lines considerable skill and ingenuity are displayed.

Surrey's invention, to follow and adopt the author's statement, did not languish ; other writers soon assisted in placing “our national poetry in the fairest and rightest way towards perfection.” Of these, Grimvald occupies the first place, in point of time, though not of merit. Nott speaks of him slightly ; but Crowe considers that to more flowing numbers than his predecessors, he joined the improvement of breaking the sentence at the end of a line. Grimvald was followed by Sackville, a writer whose powerful genius has obtained the applause of Sidney, of Pope, and of Gray. The tragedy of *Gorbuduc* appeared about five years after the publication of Surrey's Translations of Virgil. In the following passage, although far from being the most harmonious or beautiful in the drama, we see the structure of his versification :

“ The silent night that brings the quiet pause
From painful travails of the weary day,
Prolongs my careful thoughts, and makes me blame
The slow Aurore, that so for love or shame
Doth long delay to show her blushing face ;
And how the day renews my grievous plaint.”

Crowe observes that the verses of Sackville are generally

separated from each other by a point or pause at the end of each. This is accomplished, he says, by taking two nouns substantive, and fitting such an adjective to each as the measure requires; these, with the necessary particles, complete the line.

The *Steel Glass* of Gascoigne, in 1576, continues the list of our early writers of blank verse. He resembled Surrey, in closing his lines with polysyllables; as in the concluding part of the picture of a good clergyman:

“O gracious God! I see now what they be!
These be thy priests divorced from the world,
And wedded yet to heaven and holiness;
Which are not proud, nor covet to be great,
Which go not gay nor covet to be rich,
Which envy not, nor know what malice means;
Which cannot feign, which hate hypocrisy;
Which never saw Sir Simony's deceits;
Which preach of peace, which carp contentions;
Which loiter not, but labour all the year.”

The tale of the Two Swans, continues Mr. Willmott, by W. Vallens, 1592, occupies the next place. But a finer spirit of music was beginning to manifest itself among the dramatic writers. Campbell was certainly unwarranted in asserting the *David and Bethsabe* of Peele to be the earliest fountain, either of pathos or harmony, in the poetry of our stage, but it undoubtedly contained passages of more polished elegance than had hitherto appeared. Two specimens from this graceful drama will show that Peel could write with ease and sweetness:

“May that sweet plain that bears her pleasant weight
Be still enamelled with discoloured flowers;
That precious fount bear sand of purest gold;
And, for the pebbles, let the silver streams,
That pierce earth's bowels, to maintain the source.
Play upon rubies, sapphires, chrysolites:
The brims let be embraced with golden curls
Of moss that sleeps with sound the waters make,
For joy to feed the fount with their recourse;
Let all the grass that beautifies her bower
Bear manna every morn instead of dew,
Or let the dew be sweeter far than that
That hangs, like chains of pearl, on Hermon-hill.”—*Act i, s. 5.*

“Come, gentle Zephyr, tricked in those perfumes
That erst in Eden sweeten'd Adam's love
And stroke my bosom with thy gentle fan.
This shade, sun-proof, is yet no proof for thee:
Thy body smoother than this waveless spring,
Can creep through that, his lances cannot pierce,
Thou and thy sister, soft and sacred air,.

Goddess of life, and governess of health,
 Keep every fountain fresh, and garden sweet.
 No brazen gate her passage can repulse,
 No bushy thicket bar thy subtle breath,
 Then deck thee with thy loose delightsome robes,
 And on thy wings bring delicate perfumes
 To play the wanton with me through the leaves."—*Art i. c. 1.*

"Blank verse," he concludes, "from its variety, its naturalness, and its reality, seems to be appropriated to the business and the pleasures of life; it is emphatically the dialect of the theatre. In the delightful facility of Massinger, the ever-changing music of Shakspeare, the gorgeous declamation of Marlowe or Beaumont, and the grave stateliness of Ben Jonson, its happy versatility is displayed: the smile of merriment, the sneer of ridicule, the start of passion, the gasp of sorrow, all find an adequate expression. The faintest play of feature in the tragic or the comic muse is preserved in this mask, when constructed by a skilful artist.

"Milton had studied deeply the works of Jonson, whose genius, in many respects, resembled his own; equal to it in muscular strength, inferior to it in flexibility and grace; not less familiar with antiquity, but employing it with unequal success. Jonson translated the ancients; Milton imitated them; the first, content with giving a view of Greek or Latin history from the pencil of Thucydides or Sallust; the second, presenting the outline with equal fidelity, but illuminated by a sunshine of his own. Jonson, whose ear was attuned to the majestic harmony of the Attic lyre, clothed his thoughts in a diction of corresponding elevation. He trampled upon vice with a golden cothurnus. Nott quotes a passage possessing, he thinks, all the majesty and dignity of Milton's style, combined with those peculiarities by which his versification is so broadly distinguished from all who have preceded or followed him:—

"Good morrow to the day! and next my gold!
 Open the shrine that I may see my saint.
 Hail the world's soul, and mine! more glad than is
 The teeming earth to see the long'd-for sun
 Look through the horns of the celestial ram,
 Am I to view thy splendour dark'ning his,
 That lying here amongst my other hoards,
 Show'st like a flame by night, or like the day
 Struck out of chaos, when all darkness fled
 Unto the centre."—*Jonson's Works*, Vol. ii. p. 276."

Milton is followed by Bishop Ken, a writer whose love of Cowley could not always deaden the tenderness and natural pathos of his fancy. Mr. Willmott has quoted his morning

hymn, of which only a few verses are sung in our Churches, but which breathes throughout a touching and simple fervor. The specimens of his sermons will also be read with interest; his prose style is animated, flowing, and forcible. The account of Watts is affectionately written; but we think that a severer anatomy of his hymns might have been desirable, and their doctrinal peculiarities would have admitted of comment. Watts possessed great command of language, considerable skill in versification, and a warm spirit of devotion. His characteristic merit is sincerity, and his pervading fault a negligent indifference to polish and refinement of expression. His hymns for children are the best of his poetical efforts. "You remember," wrote Mr. Wilberforce to his son, "I doubt not, the last sentence in Gibbon's Autobiography; I have engaged my young friend to write under it, Dr. Watts's beautiful hymn ending with the line,— 'Fortells a bright rising again;' this is one of the hymns for children, but surely it is for the children of God, for the heirs of glory; and when you compare it, either in point of good sense, or imagination, or sterling value, or sustaining hope, with the considerations and objects which feed the fancy, or exercise the understanding or affections of the most celebrated men who have engaged the attention or called forth the eulogiums of the literati of the last century, you are irresistibly forced to exclaim, in the spirit of my grand favourite,

"O happy hymnist, O unhappy bard!"

Watts is succeeded by Young, upon whose life the writer of the present volume seems to have bestowed great labour and diligence. The subject presented considerable facilities to the biographer. With the exception of a memoir in the Aldine edition of his poems, no account of Young has been composed since Herbert Croft's contribution to Johnson's "Lives of the Poets." We are glad to find Mr. Willmott strenuously asserting the religious sincerity of Young, in opposition to the detracting criticism which has long sought to reduce the poet of the Night Thoughts to a mere courtier and man of the world; in this praiseworthy task, he has printed a delightful anecdote of Dr. Cotton's visit to Young, about a fortnight before his last illness, which Cowper communicated to his cousin, Lady Hesketh. The old man was then in perfect health, the antiquity of his person, the gravity of his utterance, and the earnestness with which he discoursed about religion, gave him, in the Doctor's eye, the appearance of a prophet.

* Mr. Wilberforce, writing to his Son in 1830; *Memoirs*, vol. v. 289.

They had been delivering their sentiments upon Newton's "Book on the Prophecies," when Young closed the conference thus: "My friend, there are three considerations upon which my faith in Christ is built, as upon a rock; the fall of man, the redemption of man, and the resurrection of man; the three cardinal articles of our religion are such as no human ingenuity could have invented, therefore they must be divine. The other argument is this: if the prophecies have been fulfilled, of which there is abundant demonstration, the Scripture must be the Word of God; and if the Scripture is the Word of God, Christianity must be true."

Passing over the notices of Blair Blackmore, whom we are glad to find vindicated from the contempt of which he has been so long the victim; Parnell, Addison, and Gray, and the unfortunate Christopher Smart; we come to a long and copiously-illustrated memoir of Cowper, which, we are informed in the preface, although subsequently revised, had been delivered to the publisher before the appearance of the Laureate's edition. Dr. Southey brought to his work advantages which have been rarely enjoyed by previous biographers. Every channel of information was readily opened to his inquiries; manuscript letters were offered to his inspection: and his own intimate acquaintance with our poetical literature, combined with the purity of his taste and the sincerity of his admiration, enabled him to apply these aids in the most effective manner. Mr. Willmott and Dr. Southey have coincided in letting the poet, as far as possible, relate his own story in those beautiful letters which would preserve his memory, though all his verses were forgotten. One of the most interesting passages of Mr. Willmott's memoir is the account of descriptive painting among the classic writers, contrasted with the same faculty in Cowper. These remarks we shall quote, in the belief that the severest criticism will admit the beauty of the sentiment, and the elegance of the diction:

"The poetical character of Cowper ought always to be considered in relation to the condition of our poetry at his appearance. The harp of Thomson was silent; the picturesque fancy of Collins shone only for a brief season, and was extinguished with his reason; Gray had bequeathed his lyre to Mason; the rich and beautiful colours of Aken-side attracted few admirers; the classical paintings of Glover faded with the excitement of political fervour; and the splendid declamation of Johnson rolled faintly over the popular ear. Darwin and Hayley were the laureates of the age: the first, by the brilliancy of his picture-poetry, dazzling the eye with a succession of pageants; the second, by the polished elegance and skilful mechanism of his verse, dividing the applause of the literary public. One addressed himself to the eye, the

other to the ear, and neither to the heart. Darwin blazed into eminence, and, by the glitter of his fancy and the luxuriance of his versification, succeeded in charming into captivity the purest taste. Even Cowper, in some graceful lines, paid a tribute to the

“ ‘Sweet harmonist of Flora’s court.’

But though he praised his works, he did not imitate them. He at once crossed, it has been said, the enchanted circle, and by breaking through the barriers between poetry and truth, regained the natural liberty of invention. His admiration of his ancestor, Donne, did not embrace his rhymes. He loved simplicity, and all the unaffected graces of nature. Nothing was too humble for his song. He knew that the sweetest honey lay hidden in the bosom of the humblest flowers ; and that from the shell, struck in an earlier age by a heedless foot, the hand of the master drew forth a strain of artful melody.

To Cowper belongs, pre-eminently, the author remarks, above any writer in our language, the title of the Poet of the Affections. Campbell compares the “Task” to a playful little fountain, which gathers beauty and magnitude as it proceeds. Cowper found the fountain in his heart. He has brought the muse, in her most attractive form, to sit down by our hearths ; and has breathed a sanctity over the daily economy of our existence. “He builds up no magic castles ; he conducts us into no enchanted gardens ; no silver lutes sigh through his verse : no wings of faëry glisten over his page. Instead of wandering along the shores of old romance, he teaches us out of the book of life, and invests with a delightful charm the commonest offices of humanity.” A poem thus addressing itself to the hopes and sympathies of mankind, will be widely felt and universally understood. When the poet works in the circle of the affections, every one acknowledges the spell of the magician. In proportion, on the other hand, as a poem recedes from the familiar pleasures and affections of life, the reader’s attention begins to droop ; and, like Cowper among the romantic scenes of Eartham, he pines for the gentler scenery of home. He pauses with no delight upon the variegated fancy of Davenant, the serious sweetness of Spenser, or the resplendent visions of Milton ; and joyfully exchanges the beautiful pomp of the attic mythology, for the dearer recollections of his native village ; for the garden-gate over which he has often hung ; the humming of the bees and the piping of the robin in his own apple-tree. Cowper, continues the writer, always associates the reader in his amusements and employments : whether we wander by his side along the banks of the Thames, feeding

“ On scarlet hips, or stony haws ;”

or gaze, with the dear companion of his walks, upon

“ The distant plough, slow moving ;”

or meditate under the roof—

———“Moveable through all its length,
As the wind sways it;”

or listen to the stock-dove, that unalarmed,

“Sits cooing in the pine-tree, nor suspends
Her long love-ditty;”

or behold his shadow, in a winter morning—

“Walk along the plastered wall.”

His pictures of in-door life have similar attractions: we seat ourselves round the glowing hearth and watch the hares “frolic on the floor,” or the needle ply “its busy task,” or the parlour-twilight uplifting the “shadow to the ceiling;” or listen to the “story of the traveller,” or the “legend of the poet—

—————
“By one
Made vocal for the amusement of the rest.”

The Winter Evening.

We weave nets to protect the “bird-alluring fruit,” or twine silken thread round ivory wheels, and close the evening “with a radish and an egg,” and “a pleasant song from Lady Austen.”

“A very ingenious critic of Aristotle,” proceeds Mr. Willmott, “supposes the Greek writers not to have described the scenery of nature in a picturesque manner, because they were unaccustomed to behold it with a painter’s eye. He thinks they had no Thomsons because they had no Claudes; and he particularly notices the absence, both in the Greek and Latin languages, of a single term accurately expressing what we understand by a prospect. The influence of painting upon poetry has, probably, been over-rated. Hallam, in the Introduction to the History of Literature, alludes to the effect produced by Giotto and his followers, in reclaiming the popular taste from the extravagances of romance, to the chaster graces of a classic antiquity. Those (he says) were ready for the love of Virgil, who had formed their sense of beauty by the figures of Giotto and the visions of Dante. But the painter derives his life from the poet; Homer inspired Phidias. It will, indeed, be readily admitted, that neither Athens nor Rome possessed a school of writers essentially descriptive. The idea of a local poem, like Cooper’s Hill, or a beautiful panoramic survey, like that of Dyer or Crowe; or a narrative of the operations, the changes, and the characteristics of the seasons, like Thomson’s; or a series of scenical illustrations, like the pictures in the Task; never presented itself to a Greek or a Roman fancy: of all the attractive sites for poetical architecture, this was the only one which they suffered to descend unoccupied to posterity. Even the graceful and senti-

mental sonneteer was anticipated by the epigrammatist of the Anthology. In the more polished and refined age of Grecian literature, few traces of external nature are discovered; so it was in our own country, under the second Charles, and in the Augustan era of Anne; and in France, during the brilliant pageant that adorned the reign of Louis XIV. The writers of those times are often eloquent and energetic; almost always harmonious; frequently picturesque; but very rarely descriptive. Their colours come from books, not from nature; their rural scenes are compositions, not sketches taken on the spot. We have the fantastic ingenuity of Cowley, the musical epigrams of Pope, and the poignant satire of Boileau; but no "silver droppis" sparkle on their foliage, as upon the sunny trees of Chaucer; no gradual, dusky veil at even-tide creeps over the glimmering hamlet, like that drawn by the finger of Collins; no glades "open to the golden day," like the sylvan solitudes of Thomson. But the eye to observe, the taste to select and combine, the fancy to colour and illuminate, were undoubtedly not withheld from the genius of attic poetry. Homer has them all. His morning pictures shine with the dew and purple dawn. Bishop Copleston, indeed, supposes the faculty of depicting external objects, separated and detached from the affections and manners, to have been either wanted by him, or despised; but the learned and elegant Hurd has advocated a very different opinion, and has been supported and confirmed by more than one accomplished critic. Homer does not, certainly, paint a landscape with the elaborate finish of a school of design; but, like Gray, hastens from the picture to the story connected with it, or to the moral which it suggests. Twining has noticed the charming line in the nineteenth book of the Odyssey, where the song of the nightingale is described with remarkable beauty and precision:—

"Ἦτε θαυθα τρωπῶσα χεεὶ πολυηχεα φωνήν."

"The pouring of her voice, its quick turns and inflections, and the ever-changing variety of tone, complete the description. His scene by moonlight is familiar to every reader of poetry. Hesiod possessed similar power, and his winter landscape may be compared with Thomson's; he has, indeed, collected into a single view, images scattered by the poet of the Seasons over several pages. Hesiod's old man, bent by the blast, may be contrasted with the way-faring stranger of Thomson climbing against the wind.

"Scarcely one of the Greek or Latin poets will be found entirely deficient in this essential element of poetical invention.

Pindar opens a view of the Fortunate Isles in his magnificent Odes; Æschylus, though chiefly distinguished by the vehemence and creative fire of his genius, in a very different kind of delineation, could sweep the solemn shadows and gloomy masses of cloud over his dramas with the savage blackness of Rosa. The softer hues of Sophocles are fresh in the memory; and the reader who has not enjoyed the brilliant scenery of the Bacchæ, is unacquainted with one of the most exquisite productions of Greek imagination.

“Descending among the Latin poets, we are struck by the presence of the same art. The Georgiis abound in sketches for the pencil. Virgil lets in the verdure of the country upon the pomp of an historical procession. Cowper could not have represented a corn field agitated by the wind in more vivid colours, than Silius Italicus; by the single epithet, *nitescit*, he makes the harvest wave, and rustle, and shine before our eyes. Statius could paint a landscape, with the dew upon it; and the colours of Horace are not less enduring than his reputation. Nor will the richly-glowing pictures of Ovid be forgotten by the student of that fascinating writer. But, however the ancients may have appreciated or pourtrayed the charms of nature, they wanted one lovely and ennobling feature. Their religion, it has been observed, is beautiful in fiction, but not in sentiment. It has revealed the most terrific and delightful agencies to poetry, without teaching it to contemplate nature as the image of Divine Benevolence, and her creatures as the objects of human sympathy. Paul planted, and Apollos watered, and the Grace of God descended upon the heart, before this intellectual garden blossomed like the rose. It was reserved for the poets of a later day, to find, in the common flower by the hedge-side, a theme of gratitude and meditation; and to uplift the eye, as it ranged over verdant fields, and waving woods, and glittering rivers, with a devout aspiration to heaven, “My Father made them all!”

James Hurdis appropriately follows his friend and master; but the “Village Curate” very faintly recalls the music of the “Task.” Hurdis was born at Bishopstone, in Sussex, 1763; and in 1780 went to Oxford, a commoner of St. Mary Hall, but was subsequently chosen a demy of Magdalen College, where he is said to have obtained the friendship of the president, Dr. Horne. Having taken his degree, in 1785, he retired to the curacy of Burwash, in his native county, where he resided six years. In 1793, he was made Poetry Professor, at Oxford; and expired after an innocent and tranquil life devoted to the cultivation of his mind and to the discharge of his pastoral duties, on the 13th

of December, 1808. The poetical character of Hurdis is not marked by any particular physiognomy. His sentiment continually sinks into affectation, and his simplicity often displeases by the familiarity of its allusions :—

Burwash will never rival the fame of the little village in Buckinghamshire. He describes, indeed, in very agreeable colours, the life of a country Clergyman, enlivening his leisure with books, music, and rural walks : but it may in truth be said of Hurdis, that he is strong only upon the ground. The conversational manner of Cowper dwindles, in his imitation, into imbecility : his satire is nerveless, and his remarks obvious, without being forcible. His poetical merit is to be sought for only in the truth of his descriptions of scenery and rustic employments. The following harvest-scene is worthy of a follower of Cowper :

“ Tell me, ye fair Aleanor, tell me, what
Is to the eye more cheerful, to the heart
More satisfactive, than to look abroad,
And from the window see the reaper stop,
Look round, and put his sickle to the wheat,
Or hear the early mower whet his scythe,
And see where he has cut his sounding way,
E’en to the utmost hedge of the brown field
Of oats or barley ? What delights us more,
Than studiously to trace the vast effects
Of unabated labour ? To observe
How soon the golden field stands thick with sheaves :
How soon the oat and bearded barley fall
In frequent lines before the hungry scythe ?
The clattering team now comes, and the swarth hind
Leaps down, and throws his frock aside, and plies
The shining fork down to the stubble’s edge
The easy wain descends half-built, then turns
And labours up again. From pile to pile
With rustling steps the swain proceeds, and still
Bears to the groaning load the well-poised sheaf.”

Village Curate.

The memoir of Grahame affords some pleasing anecdotes of a very amiable and intelligent man, who was removed in his forty-seventh year, leaving behind him a name dear to every lover of genuine poetry and sincere piety. Sir Walter Scott paid a most affectionate tribute to his virtue :—

“ Poor Grahame, (he says, in a letter to Joanna Baillie), gentle, amiable, and enthusiastic, deserves all you say of him ; his was really a hallowed harp, as he was himself an Israelite without guile. How often have I teased him, but never out of his good humour, by praising Dundee, and laughing at the covenanters. I think his works should

be collected and published, for the benefit of his family—surely the wife and orphans of such a man have a claim on the generosity of the public.”

Of his poems, “the Sabbath” is the best known, and deserves the widest popularity; it abounds in touches of fancy, and is every where pervaded by a spirit of beautiful benevolence and devotion. A memoir of Bishop Heber closes the volume. A more ample selection from the journal of this admirable prelate might have been desired, if the plan of the writer had not limited his views to the Bishop’s poetical character. “Palestine” is the only prize poem which has obtained and preserved a reputation beyond the walls of an University. The fancy of Heber was lively; his language picturesque, and his ear susceptible of every tone of music—his imagination, without much strength, possessed considerable elasticity and grace—and we cordially join in Mr. Willmott’s expression of regret that his proposed collection of Hymns was never completed.

In conclusion, and while pressing this volume, together with its predecessor, upon the attention of our readers, we will mention some suggestions that have occurred to us during the perusal, and which, we sincerely hope, a second edition will soon enable the author to take into consideration. We would particularly recommend the expansion of his preliminary essay, in the first series, so as to embrace a more comprehensive view of the moral songs of the sixteenth century.

Spenser may, at the same time, be advantageously brought more prominently forward; there is no author whose serious sweetness and pensive tenderness impart a livelier charm to the fancy. A memoir of Sir John Davies, the earliest writer of a philosophical poem in our language, ought also to be inserted. His *Nosce Teipsum* is a remarkable specimen of close argument and harmonious versification. From the following description of feeling, Pope borrowed one of his most celebrated couplets:—

“Much like a subtle spider which doth sit
In middle of her web which spreadeth wide;
If ought do touch the utmost thread of it,
She feels it instantly on every side.”

The sketches of Silvester and of Heywood will also admit of enlargement; the Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels, by the last writer, is a very curious and valuable production. An abridgement of the History of Wither will furnish ample space for these alterations. And, with respect to the second volume of the *Lives of Sacred Poets*, now more immediately under examination, we think it would be desirable to introduce a few brief and

connecting notices of some of the minor contributors to our Religious Poetry, such as Ogilvie and Merrick, for example, whose names are still found in *Elegant Extracts*.

With these improvements, slight though they be, yet not, we venture to believe, unimportant, combined with those which the maturer reflection of the Author himself will introduce, these Lives may be safely put into the hand of the student, as the most satisfactory guides into a path of our Literature which has never been investigated with equal diligence, or success, by any other writer. What Warton performed for our verse in general, Mr. Willmott has accomplished for our Religious Poetry in particular. Higher praise cannot be desired.

ART. V.—*The Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons, considered in Three Letters, addressed to the Rev. T. L. Green, Roman Catholic Priest of Tixall.* By GEORGE HODSON, M.A., Vicar of the adjoining Parish of Colwich, and Archdeacon of Stafford. London: Hamilton and Co.; Rugeley, J. T. Walters. 1838.

The Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing but the Truth. The Catholic Church Vindicated, in Two Letters, addressed to the Venerable George Hodson, M. A., Protestant Vicar of Colwich, Archdeacon of Stafford, Canon Residentiary of Lichfield, etc. In Reply to his Pamphlet, entitled, "The Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons." By the Rev. T. L. GREEN, Catholic Clergyman of Tixall. Letter I. London: Jones, Booker and Co., Keating and Co., &c.; Rugeley, J. T. Walters. 1838.

THESE two pamphlets are of considerable importance at the present time, as, additionally to their subject, proving the kind of interference which the papal priesthood in this country are beginning to assume in the ministerial conduct of the legitimate Clergy in their neighbourhood. The Archdeacon of Stafford and Vicar of Colwich thinks that the circumstances of his cure call for the circulation of certain tracts in opposition to the claims and efforts of the Church of Rome; and a neighbouring priest of that church considers it as falling within his province to call the vicar to account for so doing. Mr. Green, who for any parochial connexion, may, like his superior, be a priest in *partibus infidelium*, takes offence at a particular passage in one of the distributed tracts, and desires an interview with the distributor, for the purpose of explaining or substantiating

that passage, as containing a charge against his church of such a diabolical description, that, if true, he professes it to be his duty to abjure that church, and that he is contented to "read publicly his recantation to that effect, on any of the three next following Sundays, from the pulpit of Colwich Church." The letter of Mr. Green proceeds:

"It appears to me but courtesy to add, that in the event of your declining this proposal, and not suggesting an equivalent one in its stead, I shall consider it a duty which I owe to the cause of truth, to adopt forthwith some decisive measure for exposing the incorrectness of your statement. And I shall consider myself at liberty to publish this letter, and any reply which you may think proper to send."

This letter stands the first in Mr. Hodson's publication; and the concluding passage just quoted should be borne in mind by the reader, for it will be of use. With respect to the proposal about abjuring his church, it may be observed, that this is rather a familiar figure in the controversial rhetoric of Romanists, as there is something magnificent in the phraseology, and as it is calculated to produce an impression of the writer's confidence in his own cause. This works successfully with the mass of his own communion. Our champion never fears—why should we?

The Archdeacon wisely declined the proposed personal meeting. He probably had in prospect the field which would thereby be opened to reports and representations, where a restless zeal, loquacity, leisure, and delight in such occupation would give the party opposed to him advantages, in which he could not hope to compete with them. He therefore selected the method which would avoid many of the obstructions to truth hardly separable from private conference, and confiding in the justice of his cause, confined himself to the pen and the press, appealing to the public for the decision. Mr. Green was thrown into palpable surprise and somewhat of apparent dismay, by the promptness with which the resolution of the Archdeacon was carried into effect. The aversion of the Vicar of Colwich to controversy was well and extensively known. It might be inferred, from that circumstance, and from the laborious and almost unintermitted engagements in the appropriate and most valuable duties of his ministry and office, that his studies would not be plentifully turned into the channels of contention, even for important truth; and, that, therefore, the last thing that would be anticipated in Archdeacon Hodson, would be his public appearance in the character of a controvertist. It might accordingly be reckoned upon, as an almost certain result of the call made upon him, that he would quietly ac-

quiesce in the justice of the objection made to the offensive sentiment in the tract alluded to ; and discontinue the circulation of it. Such amends as these would doubtless be very graciously received, and reported to both high and low of the Tixall flock, with great commendation of the candour and honour of the Archdeacon, the whole accompanied with an intelligible smile ! But should the person attacked be less accommodating, and resolve upon maintaining his ground, there would even then remain very good hopes, with all the resources at command, of overwhelming the amiable lover of peace with so formidable a deluge of debate—and by simple accumulation of matter, pertinent and impertinent, it might be protracted to any limits, or rather beyond any—that the Archdeacon would feel disposed to give up the contest in despair, and resign to his indefatigable opponent a field which he could not dispute with any view of a termination, or without sacrificing to the duty of contending for the faith, other duties which, in his peculiar case, he judged most important and peremptory. Rome knows well enough how the conscientious performance of *these* duties by the Anglican Clergy of the *true* Church interfere with her own prospects ; and, therefore, if she can do no more than embarrass and impede *them*, she and her priesthood gain an important point. Should Mr. Hodson feel compelled, by the considerations above mentioned, to leave the controversy where it stands, the Christian and Protestant public will indeed have cause to regret the necessity ; although even then, little more will, in our judgment, be necessary to put the assailant in the predicament of a beaten foe than the reperusal of his pamphlet. Little more than such reperusal will be necessary to substantiate its main and most important facts and arguments. Whether the determination of Mr. Hodson may or may not be to discontinue the contest which he has so successfully begun, and has proved that he could well resume, it will be the duty of his Christian and Protestant brethren to see that the cause shall not suffer, and that neither the individual aggressor, his associates, nor his church generally considered, shall succeed in any one of the objects which they value, and which therefore they may be supposed to have in view in officious attacks, like that of the priest of Rome in Tixall.

The title of Mr. Green arrests attention. It is seldom that the most agitated writer does not recover or assume composure when he comes to the deliberate operation of fixing on the title of a proposed work. But every thing here betrays embarrassment and perturbation. What could suggest the first words cannot well be conceived, except it were the consciousness, that

at least "*the whole truth*" was not presented. "The Catholic Church vindicated," the author must know, involves a disgraceful *petitio principii*. But the designating Mr. Hodson as the "*Protestant* Vicar of Colwich," out-does all in imbecile puerility. Every body can understand the low artifice of the epithet. If a *Protestant* Vicar, then there is another Vicar, who is not Protestant, perhaps a *Popish* Vicar, perhaps Mr. Green himself. For, let him and his church repel the imputation, of wishing for the spiritualities and *temporalities* of the Establishment, and desiring themselves to become that Establishment, law-church, or whatever else they may call it, with all their might; we shall only believe it the more firmly, the more solemnly they deny it; and should they add an oath, we shall be certain. However, Archdeacon Hodson is, and is the *only*, Vicar of Colwich; and though not shrinking from, but glorying in, the title of a protestor against the aberrations and abominations of Popery in its proper place, at the present, and we trust for a long future, neither Mr. Green, nor any other worshipper of the great goddess, the vilified Mary, will be the Vicar of Colwich; and to call the Vicar, now being *Protestant*, in any of the implied or double meanings intended by Mr. Green, betrays something of the same ignorance which has made him, innocently enough, give the Archdeacon the title of "Very Reverend!" or himself, [as peculiar, that of "Catholic!"] It was not understood before, that the papal clergy were ashamed of the name of *Priest*, and coveted that of *Clergyman*. They have a full right to denominate themselves clergy of *their own* church—they are none of *ours* without public recantation.

But the self-appropriation of the title "Catholic" is the grand object of papal ambition. Mr. Green knows as well as any Protestant, that the *particular* Church of Rome is no more the Catholic Church, than the *county* of Stafford is *all* England. The only question which concerns his church, and himself as of it, is, whether it is Catholic *at all*—whether the infectious nature of the poison which it has infused into Christianity has not rendered the whole mass deleterious, unchristian, uncatholic: and whether, when we are so liberal towards her as to allow her a simple being, it is not that of a being in the last stage of mortal disease? Mr. Green may think and speak otherwise under penalty of a consciousness of falsehood; but if he, or any of his cloth, as some of them are not ashamed to do, tell the people of our church, that in respecting the Apostle's Creed, where the Catholic Church is mentioned, and in praying in our Liturgy for the Catholic Church, they recognize the Church of Rome as *the* Catholic Church, and the *alone* Catholic Church, (for only this will serve their turn,) he

and they must be informed, that they are guilty of an act in which the only question is, whether the want of knowledge or the want of integrity predominates. Mr. Green, in his Preface, writes, that the charge which he combats is a charge "against the Catholic Church." He knows, and cannot deny, that, in deed, and in words, this is an absolute, and it could not be an unknown, falsehood! The charge made is the charge of a Catholic against an *anti*, or at least against a *non*-Catholic Church. We fear that falsehood is so engrained in the ethics of the Church of Rome as to be invincible and inseparable.

Having disposed of these preliminaries, we approach the substance.

The passage which is the proposition in the present controversy occurs in a tract of eight pages thus entitled :

"No. LXX.—Church of England Tract Society, instituted in Bristol, in 1811. The Differences between Protestantism and Popery briefly stated. 1830."

In the seventh page we read—

~ "8thly. I PROTEST AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ROME, because she believes that pardon for sins *past, present, and to come*, may be sold by her clergy; and that it is in their power, *unconditionally*, to grant such pardons for money."

The reader may be pleased to read and consider a parallel charge thus translated: "Nothing is given in the Roman Court but for money. For the very imposition of hands, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, are sold. Nor is the pardon of sins granted except for cash." The original stands thus: *Nihil est quod absque argento Romana curia dedat. Nam et ipsæ manus impositiones, et Spiritus Sancti dona venduntur. Nec peccatorum venia nisi nummatis impenditur.* These are the words of the celebrated Æneas Sylvius, who became pontiff of Rome in the year 1458, and died in 1464; and they are found in a letter to a friend.* It is of little or no consequence, that his holiness, at the *close* of his pontificate and life, and during the sickness which was mortal, directed, or suffered to be penned and directed, a letter, *not a bull*, commonly called his bull of retractation, and standing last but one of his Constitutions in the Bullarium, to the Rector and University of Cologne, expressing and excusing, in the most amusing manner, all his writings contrary to the professed doctrines of the church which

* Ep. LXVI., p. 549. Opp. Basil. 1571. It is the same in the edition of Lyons, 1505, except the plainly false insertion of *si* after *et*, which may have been a mistake for *etiam*.

he had then governed for five years without any such notification of his miraculous conversion and repentance. He was totally indifferent during five years, and the whole (as it may be called) of his pontifical reign, to the ravages which were being made in the church by the uncontradicted, uncensured circulation of his own pernicious juvenile writings; and was only induced to swallow the bitter pill of recantation when the sand of his hour-glass was nearly spent; when terror, or pain, or insensibility, rendered him incapable of resistance, and made his apparent act the act of *others* rather than his own.

The whole indeed is so ludicrously unfounded in argument, and visibly insincere, that it is worth no notice whatsoever. As little stress can be laid upon the simple mention of *the Court*; for if the Court and Church of Rome were not as completely identical as the Archbishop and Duke of Cologne, in the well-known anecdote, the very *subject* matter of the passage adduced is perfectly and exclusively *ecclesiastical*. Here then we have the writer of the penny tract, and "the sanctity of our lord, the pope," perfectly united in sentiment, and nearly so in expression, respecting the pecuniary and venal character of the spiritual transactions of the Church of Rome. Let the Roman sportsmen then take especial care, lest, when they only mean to bring down a humble Protestant scribe, the shot should go into the heart of a pope and lay him prostrate.

Of the author of the obnoxious tract, it appears, that the venerable author of the *Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons* knows as little as we do, that is, nothing at all. The tract itself seemed to him, we doubt not, as well founded and unexceptionable as is fairly to be expected in popular productions of that description; and upon deliberate re-consideration, he felt convinced that the passage particularly annoying to his papal neighbour was capable of defence. He, therefore, resolved not to desert or surrender a worthy fellow-soldier in the cause of Christian truth and liberty; and the result was as we have seen. Mr. Hodson well knew in how arduous a service he was about to engage, and how difficult it would be to fix a charge upon individuals who, being conscious of their liability to such charges, were forearmed with every contrivance to escape detection and to mislead, and who, with consummate skill, had furnished themselves with every weapon which obscurity, equivocation, and contradictory statements could put into their practised hands. Evidence *demonstrative* was out of the question; *legal* was, except in some accidental cases, almost the same. All that remained, except by the benefit of accident, and *real* differences in the body, was *moral* evidence of various kinds and degrees;

but, in the present instance, quite sufficient to afford private conviction to a conscientious inquirer; and quite sufficient to allow of its being presented with confidence to a reasonable public. It certainly would be a very pleasing and relieving circumstance, if the guilty in any instance would generously and disinterestedly come forward, and openly declare their own evil deeds, and in this obliging manner spare the friends of society the frequently fruitless and thankless labour of screwing out of reluctant and very incommunicative witnesses what they could most profitably disclose at the cheap expence of only so much breath. But this is rather too much to expect; and so the usual toil must be continued, and we must do the best we can.

There is no violation of candour or justice in the foregoing representation, because the charge itself, certainly a formidable one, implies it. If the accused can clear themselves, very well. As the case is, and under the evident disadvantages, Mr. Hodson justly observes, that it is fortunate, and probably from a designed adherence to *accuracy*, that the tract-writer has not said, that the Church of Rome *teaches*, but that she *believes*, &c. The Church of Rome takes as much care as she can what she *teaches*, what she plainly and openly declares. Although, and sorely against her will and precaution, things of a very confidential and decisive description sometimes transpire, the discovery is seldom if ever imputable to negligence or improvidence on her part. The necessary publicity of most of her acts is the principal reason why some of them come to light; and security during her unopposed tyranny is another. At all events, Rome will never, if she can help, disclose her iniquities *totidem verbis*. But however desirable this might be, it is *not necessary*. Enough is proveable, morally so, by other and various means, to justify the conviction of the guilt to ourselves, and the statement of that conviction to others, for their safety, or instruction, as it may happen. The Church of Rome *believes*. What is the Church of Rome? The editors of the "Penny Cyclopædi," a publication in which the anti-religious character of some articles has been exposed and chastised in the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, have acknowledged the Article, "CATHOLIC CHURCH," to have been supplied by the pen of Dr. Wiseman! And we perceive that the Doctor starts with the admission, that the laity constitute an efficient part thereof. The great body of the faithful, although in general treated but unceremoniously, sometimes, that is at a pinch, stands the holy Catholic Church in good stead. It has been made by the voluminous *Perpetuité* writers the refuge of infallibility itself, when hunted from its usual localities. Now, what does this great portion of the Roman Church *believe*.

Numbers are a palmary argument in some popular inquiries: what does the overwhelming *majority* of the Roman Church believe? It is plain what they believe, by their acts, by their superstitions, by every practical exhibition or escape of their religion. What does the papal population in *Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland*, (where popery expands freely), believe of the absolution of their confessors and the indulgences of their Pope and others? What spiritual sufferings do these poor creatures submit to, because they take the words of their Church too *literally*?—because they believe her, when, behind the scenes, and to a select number, she says, that she does not mean to be believed. But we shall have to enter upon this topic more largely.

Although the *substantial* truth of the charge against the Church of Rome, as to her saleable pardons of sin, be proveable enough, it has appeared, that a competent cloud may be, and is, raised about it, sufficient to obscure, although not to eclipse, its light. The reader must be informed, or bear in mind, that the spiritual pardons of Rome are either sacramental absolutions of guilt, as part and parcel of the sacrament of penance, or the supplemental remission of the punishment due after the foregoing remission, and to be endured in this life or the second life in purgatory, by an indulgence or indulgences of various kinds and virtues.

We may be allowed just to ask here, what provision is made for *possible mortal* sins, and, therefore, *culpa*, after sacramental absolution, except the indulgence supply it? and then the indulgence has respect to *culpa*. Indeed Morinus, *de Pœnit*, lib. x. c. xxii. has been obliged to admit, and even contend for, the application of indulgences to *culpa*. That such was generally meant to be the impression by the donors, is past any doubt, though *now* a new *chant* must be sung.

Indulgences, likewise, according to the more orthodox popish belief, are a remission of canonical penance or penances; although, of these, and of purgatory, gentlemen of the Roman communion, both cleric and laic, are very shy. The fictitious purgatory hereafter puts them into a real purgatory here, because it is to this fable that indulgences, in the modern sense, owe their origin and popularity, as good Bishop Fisher, in the well-known passage has informed us;* and because it is to the same fable that the lucrative trade of masses, as well as indulgences, owes its principal success. It is, therefore, running into a mistake to confine the Roman Church's venality to indulgences,

* Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio, per Rev. Pat. Joannem Roffensem, Ep. Paris: Chevallon, 1523. Art. 18, fo. lxxxvii.

although these frequently include the sacramental pardons of guilt by means of an optional confessor. The direct and undisputed pardons of sin, its guilt, as well as *reatus* and punishment, issue from the *confessional*, and have prices connected with them, as the different *Taxe Penitentiarie* exhibit, and as they are publicly and without contradiction assigned to the Roman ecclesiastical courts. The great body of the articles in the *Taxe* are *Absolutiones*. But Mr. Green promises us to enter *boldly* into this subject in his second letter. Let him take care that he is not *too* bold.

At present the inquiry is confined to *indulgences*. The sacramental absolution of sin is confessedly, we mean, in the Roman Church, derived from the hypothetical power of the keys; indulgences come originally under the same head as matter of jurisdiction, but particularly through the medium of a certain treasury constituted of the superfluous merits of Christ, with those of the saints, more especially the Virgin Mary, and this is committed, as a kind of perquisite, to the disposal of the Bishop of Rome—a species of spiritual stock or capital, which he may put out to the best advantage of the papal treasury and the papal church. It is, almost without a figure, the paper credit of the Church, and by means of visionary, brings in solid, wealth to the coffers of the Vatican. We hear little of this treasury in heretical Britain, but in good Catholic countries there is no concealment. In the Bull of *Indiction* of the last Jubilee, by Leo XII. it stands full out; but in the *Extension* of that jubilee, intended for *foreign* countries, and some partially heretical, it is only daintily insinuated. The fact is, in the sunshine of Protestantism, Popery is ashamed of some of her main doctrines. In the examination of the Irish titulars by the Commission in 1825, and particularly that of Dr. Doyle, which we shall perhaps make more prominent in a future place, the grand treasure is kept a profound secret. It might be feared the imperial government would *appropriate* it. It was proper to place this matter before the reader, as it will serve materially to make clear what is to follow.

There is nothing which the examined heads of the papacy in Ireland wished to inculcate on the point of indulgences more decidedly, than that an indulgence has nothing to do with the pardon of sins at all: but it is necessary to add, "*properly speaking.*" Reader mark this well. Mr. Hodson, contrasting the smooth talk of these and other divines with the bold, uncompromising, unlimited language of the great fathers of the Catholic Church, is at a natural loss to reconcile the two; although common sense would determine, that the great father should be believed in preference to any of his sons, "authorised exposi-

tors" as they may be, "properly" understood. The first instance produced by Mr. Hodson is Urban II. who was nearly the first granter of general indulgences ; and they were granted to the crusaders who joined the expedition to the Holy Land to recover it from the Saracens.* This indulgence was a good downright pardon, clenched in its interpretation by being declared to be an entrance into the paradise of bliss. We do not stop to repeat the representation in the pamphlet, but simply observe, that we apprehend the able writer meant to refer for his authority, not to Baronius, who is at the foot of page seven, and who has nothing of the detail given by the Archdeacon, but to Morini *de Pœnitent.* last book, ch. xix. pp. 765, &c., who has all. Mr. Hodson then goes through a succession of popes, who all, like honest and rightful dispensers of the treasure entrusted to them, were no niggards in offering them as sound articles to their subjects for value to be received. What they meant to perform, or could perform, is another thing : their offers were without stint. O, no ! they were not without stint—*conditions* were annexed ; the receivers must be *contrite, truly contrite, and confessed.* Perhaps we may be able to get over this without much trouble ; for Mr. Græen will help us.

The second Letter of the Archdeacon begins with the formidable battery of the *Centum Gravamina* at the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1523. Mr. Green will take good advice, if he refrain from trying his teeth on this file. We will recommend to his perusal a book of some value on the subject, *Imperatorum Imperique Principum ac Procerum Totiusque Nationis Germanicæ Gravamina*, &c. a J. F. Georgii-Francof. et Lipsiæ, 1725. We hasten forward, and therefore barely refer to the appalling *fact* of the performances of the dominican, Tetzels, respecting indulgences—performances, which we take upon ourselves, without encountering a very heavy load, to say, *we are sure* would have passed without a single, even the most gentle, reprimand from the highest authorities in the Roman Church,

* It is a curious fact, that in issuing indulgences against the Saracens or Turks, the Turks determined to be even with the Pope in issuing what may be called opposition indulgences in due form ; for as a full pardon of sins was offered to the Mahometan who killed a Christian as if he had personally visited Mecca—Videtur enim quod qui non potest peregrinari ad Meccam, si unum interficiat Christianum, ita plenam obtinet veniam peccatorum ac si Meccam personaliter visitasset. Raynaldi from Jordanus MS. Vat. Annal. sub anno 1319. § xxxi. tom. v. p. 125, ed. ult. We were directed to this fact by Amort, but have verified it.

had not opposition, exposure, and scandal made another course necessary. And here again may be recommended to Mr. Green's attention *Vita J. Tezeli a Godef. Hechtio, &c. Vitembergæ, 1717.** We must not omit just to refer to the well-known passage of Claude d'Espanse, produced by Mr. Hodson, where, not only the infamous traffic of Rome in pardons is substantiated, but that able writer's own view of their meaning and turpitude is demonstrated, in spite of every effort to evade or explain it away.

But really it is losing time, which we mean to employ more profitably, to detail farther the contents of a publication which ought to be in every faithful Protestant's hands, and which we shall perhaps convince the reader before we have done stands entire and uninjured, except in some trifling oversights, which are hardly worth notice, except to Mr. Green, and those who are in the same bark with him.

To him indeed it should appear that such oversights are matters of great importance, if we may form any conclusion from the exultation with which he detects and dwells upon them; and he pays Protestants the compliment of shewing what he thinks of his own cause by so doing.

We are now happy to pay our undivided respects to the priest of Rome residing in Tixall. We have already noticed the rather whimsical, and really objectionable title of his pamphlet; and we could offer some remarks upon the rather grotesque complaints made by him against the assailed Archdeacon, on account of the unexpected promptness with which the latter laid the correspondence between them (the whole, as far as he could when called for) before the public, on the pretence of its being a violation of confidence; and that, after the blustering threat in his first letter. In some degree indeed Mr. Green is entitled to sympathy. He could hardly be ignorant, or insensible, that the Archdeacon's publication had put his sincerity to the test; and having made the magnanimous promise of a public recantation, if the charge against his church was substantiated, he could not avoid feeling that the *public* would look upon him as bound to redeem his pledge, and would be disappointed if the novel and impressive spectacle should not take place. But a reverend controvertist, whatever the temptation, should, in such cases as this, lose neither temper nor manners, in both which we fear the champion of the papal cause in Tixall has failed.

* This work is valuable in every respect, but particularly in containing specimens of different papal pardons, or indulgences.

We thought Mr. Green understood the language and habits of his church better than to refer to decrees of the 21st and of the last sessions of the Council of Trent for any real abandonment of the principle and practice of vendible indulgences. The language of the Council is bold; but with whom lies the *interpretation*, and the punishment too? The *principle* was expressly sanctioned. We will admit, that *caution* was both expedient and enforced. This was the case at a former period. Clement VII., in 1525, announced a Jubilee—the first after the formidable eruption in 1517; and he forbore the usual demand of money from the visitors of Rome, in order to avoid public offence, since Luther had taken occasion of venting his calumnies on account of such donation. So we are told by the honest bigot Raynaldi.*

For several pages from the 8th, Mr. Green, with strange superfluity, goes over the usual ground of the principles upon which the indulgences of the Roman church are founded. And here we have his, and *some* of his church's, views of *temporal* and *eternal* punishment; and cases from scripture, to prove that, when the guilt is removed, some temporal punishment may yet remain due, and to be inflicted. We are not exactly inquiring here into the *truth* of doctrines, but into the fact of what are the doctrines which Rome holds? Yet it may be of use to observe, that it is obviously false, that punishment is ever exacted, where guilt (*culpa*) is not present and contemplated at the time. Otherwise, we speak with reverence, the punishment would be unjust. And *authoritatively* to remit punishment is so far to remit guilt. When our divine Lord assumed the acknowledged divine prerogative of forgiving sins, he appealed, as the proof of his possession of it, to the exercise of the more sensible, and, as the argument should seem to require, the *greater* power of curing a diseased person.† And it may be suspected, that the earliest granters of modern indulgences were more sharp-sighted than their successors; and, when they said or wrote *culpa*, meant *culpa*. We must not anticipate farther here.

The predilection which Romanists discover for illustrating the power of the officers of their Church by that of the civil magistrate and judge, lets out the secret of their longings after secular authority, and the insincerity of their exclamations against a law-church. If indeed they cannot—what would most please them—have the law at their feet, they would be exceed-

* Ob publicam scilicet offensionem, quod ex hujusmodi largitione Lutherus oblatrandi occasionem sumpsisset. Cap. i. Tom. xxii., p. 505, ed. ult.

† Matthew ix. 2, &c.

ingly glad to have it at their right hand, to uphold them, and do work of which themselves are ashamed. But as to any benefit which they seek to obtain by this illustration, let them know, that the *law of the land*, not the *opinion of the judge*, is the *rule*; and that new trials may be moved for and granted, in case of false or doubtful judgment.

The charge of *omissions* brought against Mr. H. may be easily disposed of. They chiefly concern the expressions, *contriti et confessi*, sometimes with the addition of *verè*. Such omissions, and they are not universal, (see p. 29 of Mr. Hodson's letters), we are confident, were quite unintentional, and as confident that they are quite unimportant; for the words were evidently little more than forms. What more could be expected, for instance, from the character of the first crusaders, to whom it would be amusement, independently of pardon and paradise on an infallible word, to continue their old occupations of fighting and plundering? * One can easily imagine with what kind of certificate of contrition and confession, they would come to head-quarters, and get the wholesale indulgence. It would be a matter of curiosity to know exactly in what form and with what ceremony the precious boon was conferred. There are, we believe, compendious ways of baptising a regiment. †

At page 23, Mr. Green again refers to an indulgence adduced by Mr. Hodson, as published by Clement X. in 1671, and applicable *in articulo mortis*. Mr. H. relied upon the authority of Bishop Stillingfleet, and unfortunately the Bishop had given no reference. This, of course, increases the importunity of Mr. Green to have one; and, with some apparent misgiving, he

* Something of this kind is observed by Fleury, in his valuable *Discours VI. on Indulgences*, occurring in his *Hist. Eccles.* tom xviii. at the beginning.

† Mr. Green appears to be rather scandalized at what he supposes Mr. H.'s levity respecting the military pilgrims. It may be worth his while to read what a most unexceptionable witness has written of the behaviour of these *vere penitentes et contriti*, as well as *confessi*, when they had arrived as far as Constantinople. *Ipsique Christiani, nequiter deducebant se, quoniam civitatis palatia sternebant, et incendebant, et auferebant plumbum, unde ecclesiæ erant coopertæ, et vendebant Græcis.* The emperor accordingly sent them packing over the Bosphorus, (brachium); and then they behaved so ill, that their head, Peter the Hermit, was obliged to abandon them. This is an extract from *Belli Sacri Historia*, the *original* of the first piece in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, which is but an abridgment. The whole is given in Mabillon and Germain's *Museum Italicum*, tom. 1; Pars alt, pp. 130. 239. Surely, such penitents as these are not objects of sentimental approbation, however they may be of grief, for their profligacy, delusion, and fate.

seems willing to insinuate, that it may be either an invention or a mistake. We are persuaded it is neither, and believe we can very satisfactorily explain the matter. But every omission of distinct reference in the controversy with those who build their chief hopes of success on the oversights or neglects of their opponents, is a subject of regret. We can relieve the alarm for Protestant reputation, lest "the *whole* truth" should not be stated.

The passage in Stillingfleet, as quoted by Mr. Hodson, is—"So lately as the year 1671, Clement X. published an indulgence on the canonization of five new saints, wherein he grants a plenary indulgence of all his sins to any one who, *at the point of death*, should invoke but one of these saints."—P. 10. The work from which this extract is made, is, "Doctrine and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented, in answer to a book intituled a Papist Misrepresented," &c. by Gother. Mr. Green professes himself to have consulted his Bullarium in vain for the document. He was certainly unluckily if he did not find the constitution as relating to the saintess, Rosa of Lima; for her name in our edition stands in its proper place; and though there is an indulgence for the partakers of the ceremony, it certainly has not the clause in question. Of three besides of the five, we find one in the Supplement of the Bullarium; another, the Jesuit-General, Borgia, in the Prague edition of the Institutum Soc. Jesu. I. 179; the third in the last edition of the Bullarium in 1733, tom. vii. p. 123. All these documents, however, belong to the year 1724, about half a century after the canonization. The particular clause is in none. The individual of whom we can find nothing is Cajetan Thienæus. We were not, however, afraid of Stillingfleet; and in a tract of that busy and portentous year—much like the present—1688, we meet with one in answer to "Gother's Good Advice to the Pulpits," entitled "Apology for the Pulpits," by John Williams, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, to which is subjoined an Appendix, by Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, where, p. 15, he exhibits "Indulgenze che la Santita di Signore Clemente Papa X. concede, &c. in occasione della Canonizatione de' Santi Confessori, Gaetano, Francesco Borgia," &c. It occupies three small quarto pages, and towards the end is the following: "Chi raccomanderà devotamente à Dio *in articolo di morte* l'anima sua, ed insieme ricorrerà all'intercessione de' sudetti Santi, ò d'uno di essi con la bocca, ò, non potendo, col cuore, essendosi confessato, e comunicato, ò non potendo, almeno contrito, conseguisca plenaria indulgenza di suoi peccati.

MICHEL ANGELO RICCI, Sec.

In Roma, nella Stamperia della Rev. Cam. Apost. 1676.

Con Licenza de' Superiori.

The year 1675, and, by an *Extension* to foreign countries, 1676, was a jubilee, when such spiritual playthings were freely dispersed; and we have no doubt this was a broadside got into England and referred to by Stillingfleet. The document itself, when thus produced, was never denied. Gother wrote expressly against Williams in his *Pulpit Sayings*; but not a word against the Italian Indulgence. Williams replied in *Pulpit Popery True Popery*, and repeated Stillingfleet's assertion; not a word in contradiction. We will indulge Mr. Green with another document, nearer to the point which he is urging; and we hope we are gratifying an inquirer after *truth*. If he will look into the continuation of the Bullarium, Luxemburg, 1730, under the year 1675, the jubilee year, he will find a Breve of Clement X. confirming and renewing indulgences *pro Archiconfraternitate Cincturorum, et Cincturarum, &c.*, and there he will find indulgences by wholesale, and not only *in mortis articulo*, but *toties quoties, a pœna et a culpa*, and for *hundreds and thousands* of years. Let him question, if he dares, what stands in the face of every popish reader in his own Bullarium, and not more ancient than the year 1675. If he should still be disposed to prove to Protestants how absolute is the term and thing of the application of an indulgence *in articulo mortis*, we recommend to his notice the constitution of Benedict XIV. Non. Apr. 1747. *Ampliatur Facultas in mortis articulo*. Pia Mater, &c. Bull. Ben. XIV. last edition, tom. v. pp. 204, &c.*

For the identity of absolution in the English Church with that of the Roman, (although a fundamental identity be quite clear to the sagacity of a voluptuous prime minister), we send him and Mr. Green, for clearer conceptions, to the admir-

* We suffer what is written above to stand, although we have since very unexpectedly lighted upon a book, familiar to us, but not very common, where the indulgence in honour of the five saints is given at length, both in Latin and in English. The date is the year 1671, that of the canonization: but we have no doubt the document was put into Italian in the jubilee years, and that therefore the date 1676 is right as to the translation. We should likewise observe, that the Latin has *omnium* peccatorum; whereas the Italian *omits* the word answering to *omnium*—doubtless by oversight. We owe this discovery to *True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England*. By ANDREW SALL, Doctor in Divinity, Oxford, 1676. Part ii. pp. 203-210, where he is discussing the subject of indulgences with much power and as much *knowledge*. Of this furiously assailed character see the defence by the learned Franciscan, PETER WALSH, in the second of his Four Letters—an individual not likely to suffer much from an interested aspersion in our Upper House of Legislature

able tract of Bishop Mant, reviewed by us in a former Number. Not, however, to dismiss the subject without a present word, *our absolutions are neither sacramental, nor necessary, nor absolute.*

Pages 28 and the following are left at present to be more fully considered at the close. They are as valuable as bank paper, or, at least, valuable in proportion to the reputed solvency of the bank.

At page 37, Mr. Green is so overseen as to imagine that what Mr. Hodson said concerning stigmatising the *persons* of offending questors, is confuted by an edict of Leo X. directed to Cardinal Cajetan, simply against *erroneous sentiments* on the subject of indulgences: and the whole is pompously given both in the original and in a translation. Why! Leo might roar like a lion, or thunder like Jupiter, against *abstract* errors, and nobody be hurt, and nothing be done. And yet, upon this pure nullity, Mr. Green has the temerity—we ought to use a much harsher term—to talk of Mr. H.'s being convicted “as guilty of notorious falsehood!” The Archdeacon may at least congratulate himself that he escapes with as sound a skin from the *telum imbelles sine ictu* of the Romish priest, as the celebrated questor might have done from the thunderbolt of the pontiff.

We believe that Mr. Green has quite missed his aim in imputing to his opponent, p. 54 and 55, a misconception of a passage in the angelic doctor, notwithstanding his puerile exultation. But we shall come to that passage shortly.

The pamphlet closes with a sentiment which is as amusing to us as we doubt not it was to the self-complacent writer? It has likewise something in the pert effort to be severe so similar to the close of the last letter of the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer to the Rector of Sutton Coldfield, that we should ascribe it to the same pen, if it were possible that one person could be two. For what the Council of Trent did, in the way of reforming abuses, particularly as to residence and pluralities, we beg to refer Mr. Green for instruction to Ranchin's *Review of the Council of Trent*, English translation, by Langbaine, lib. 5, cap 3, pages 267-8, where he will learn, that whatever reforms were enacted and literally expressed in some of its decrees, the power by dispensation, lodged finally in the hands of the Pope, rendered them perfectly nugatory.

We now go back to the 28th page, and read as follows:—

“But the fact is, Rev. Sir, that these pardons of sins, and remissions of sins, which are mentioned in the Popes' bulls,* are *not*, properly speaking, pardons of sins; they are merely remissions of the temporal

* And various other authentic instruments.—Ed.

punishment. The sins themselves and the eternal punishment, would necessarily be remitted upon contrition and confession, and the indulgence or remission of the temporal punishment is superadded to those who comply with the other conditions. The expressions, 'venia peccatorum' and 'remissio peccatorum,' are *technical* expressions, as familiarly understood by a Catholic theologian as any legal technicality is by a gentleman of the law. The reader must be aware, that in every science there are words and expressions which are called *technicalities*, or words and expressions peculiar to such science. It is the case in the various mechanical trades, as well as in the liberal sciences. There are words and expressions in every trade which are well understood by persons in the same trade, but which to others would appear either strange or nonsensical. These technicalities, moreover, though perfectly true in the sense in which they are used, would, many of them, but ill bear a strictly literal interpretation; and much less would the science itself bear to be held responsible for the incongruous deductions which might easily be drawn from them. Take for instance, an axiom in the British Constitution. It is an established principle in the British Constitution that 'the King (or Queen) can do no wrong.' So again, that certain offenders shall *suffer*, "*without benefit of clergy.*"

It is well known, that the usual form of papal indulgences, especially the more solemn, as at the secular and other jubilees, is pardon in all degrees of comparison, pardon of all sins, even the most enormous; pardons from guilt and punishment, *a culpa et pœna*, at the point of death, real or presumed; and *toties quoties*, as often as required. These are the usual (perhaps in one portion or other) invariable forms of indulgences, great and small, universal, corporate, or particular. We have before us several specimens of particular indulgences, of fraternities, &c., *printed*, (on account of the large demand), and generally on parchment, with blank spaces for names and dates, though the year is generally expressed. There are likewise, in the very useful work of Amort *on Indulgences*, of which we shall make use, a large collection of the various forms of indulgences. It is proper to make this statement at this place.

But we must not omit the first feeling of gratitude to Mr. Green, for furnishing us in the above quotation with a description, the most graphic and discriminating which can well be conceived, of his own Church in its main characteristic, as a great spiritual trading company, speculating to an almost unlimited extent, and with nearly equal success, in the crimes of man, having at its head a governor and directors of consummate skill and vigilance, with a select appointment of able and efficient clerks, perfect adepts in the duties of their office, furnished with all the instruments, forms, and facilities, all the "*technicalities*," and various "*ingenious devices*," necessary both to secure to the

concern a profitable secrecy, as well as, in cases of detection, impunity, and at the same time to acquire for it the largest possible returns of treasure, influence, and power.* We thank the writer, likewise, for divulging with inimitable *naïveté* one of the principal engines of logic which his religion needs—the arbitrary application of the qualifying words, “*not properly*.” There is hardly any case of supposable embarrassment, in which this potent engine would not afford the desired relief.

Mr. Green dilates upon the parallels which he has excogitated in illustration of his new dialectic canon with so much glee and triumph, that it goes rather against us to disturb his happiness. Yet we fear we must run the risk of so doing. Truth makes it incumbent upon us to observe, that parallels, in order to hold and do execution, should *agree in the point on which the argument turns*. Now it appears to us, that it was necessary, in the first place, that as all the plain terms of the indulgences were, from the necessity of Mr. Green’s argument, to be interpreted figuratively, (for he sees the precipice before him if they are not), both the words “king” and “clergy” must be interpreted figuratively, which they are not. In fact, and Mr. Green well knows it, both of the adduced phrases are as certainly and correctly understood, as any information with which the use of them is necessarily connected, is obtained. We are indeed compelled to say, that, in our view, hardly a more miserable imposition can be conceived than that which Mr. Green has here attempted; and we are persuaded none of his readers will be so cruel as to deprive the author of *his own mare’s nest*. We can only say, and it is worth Mr. Green’s serious consideration, that there is no trap which the designing are more ready to set, and the simple to fall into, than *false or defective parallels*. We could give a parallel of our own, which might indeed yield in technicality to Mr. Green’s, but we venture to think, would not be less just: a condemned traitor is recommended to mercy and obtains the pardon of his sovereign in the most express and un-

* The enormous income derived from indulgences may be calculated from the fact, that they sufficed, for the main part, if not the whole, of the *pay* of the immense armies, principally under the name of crusades, raised or assisted by the pope. Raynaldi speaks familiarly of indulgences as the *stipendia* to be furnished by his holiness. The *Bula Cruzada* of Spain is a present proof of what such wares were worth to Rome before the trade was spoiled. Collections, by means of indulgences, for churches, hospitals, bridges, and other public works, might be adduced as additional proofs. As much imitation as is feasible of this spiritual imposition is at this time practised in the British empire. Great sums pass to their destination without ever taking the papal treasury in their way by means of particular funds.

limited terms; and then he is told, that his treason does "not properly" signify treason, and that the pardon of it does "not properly" signify pardon; and that, therefore, though he is not to be hanged, drawn, embowelled, and quartered, he must still be carried in a cart to the place of execution, and in order to have some little taste of what purgatory is, must just consent to be beheaded; because after the guilt of treason is remitted, a certain quantity of temporal punishment, reaching into purgatory, may be due. A pretty technicality, and very intelligible to the spiritual tradesmen, factors, and gentlemen of the law in the Church of Rome.

Mr. Green, in the above quoted passage, has said, that indulgences "are merely remissions of the temporal punishment." *Merely!* He has here followed one of his *authorised* guides, Dr. Doyle; and we are anxious to call attention to that—not "right reverend"—divine. The Irish titular was examined before a Parliamentary Committee of the Commons, March 18, 1825; and then and there he says, that an indulgence is a forgiveness of "the temporary punishment due to the sin, after the guilt of it has been remitted upon true repentance." He was asked by his examiners, who certainly were not very expert in papal technicalities, whether an indulgence did not relieve from *penance*, and whether the extraordinary length of the penances was not avoided by an indulgence? He answers, no: and talks something about their long disuse, without seeming to know much about the subject himself. But the main point is, he excludes from the effect of indulgences *relaxation of penance*. Now, this was said by the pseudo-prelate, when he might have in his hands, published the year before the indiction of the jubilee of 1825, by Leo X. where the pontiff presses upon his brethren, that *they* may press upon their different charges, "the great force and virtue of the indulgences; the amazing produce which may be obtained from them in the remission, *not only of the canonical punishment*, but likewise of the *temporal punishment* due to the divine justice on account of transgressions; and finally, the vast succours which they will themselves derive from that heavenly treasury, through the merits of Christ and the saints."* Now here are plainly *two* distinct effects of the jubilean indulgence, remission of the temporal punishment, remission of canonical punishment; and we could support his holiness's

* *Vestrarum item sit partium disserere accurate, quanta indulgentiarum vis sit, quantus habetur earum fructus in remissione non canonicæ solum, sed et temporalis pænæ pro peccatis debitæ apud divinam justitiam; quantum denique subsidii ab cœlesti illo thesauro, &c.*

orthodoxy by many unexceptionable witnesses, particularly the late V. A. of the Midland District, Bishop of a Turkish diocese which he never visited or cared for. And yet the Irish doctor throws the canonical effect completely overboard in the very breath in which he had just before trippingly said, "I am certain that the Pope, upon this matter, thinks as we do, for he is a divine of the Catholic Church, and so is Gothe, and so am I" &c. And here is their agreement! Both the doctor, and the priest his follower, shrink from the canonical penance, (although about the eleventh century it ceased,* and was replaced by *arbitrary* penance and *redemptions* or *buyings off*, as the reader will find in the last book of Morinus's work already referred to), because it brings into proximate and necessary view Purgatory, and the *centenary and millenary pardons*, from which Mr. Green and his friends will find some difficulty in disengaging themselves and their Church.

But this is not so much our point yet. We have another and earlier passage in the Indiction Bull, which will bring the whole of the present controversy to an issue. It is no antiquated document, though speaking the same language as those which are. It is as modern and present as it can be—its date is the great year 1825, (of which the pseudonymous Pastorini had some *vision*), the last jubilee, more dear and solemn on account of the preceding interruption; for 1800 was a blank. During this year, when papal Ireland was on tiptoe for another jubilee: "During this year of Jubilee," (speaks the cathedrated oracle), "we mercifully in the Lord grant and impart the most plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins, to all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, who are truly penitent, and have confessed, and who have likewise refreshed themselves with the holy communion—provided" they shall visit certain churches, and pray for the church, for the extirpation of heresies, and for the salvation and tranquillity of Christendom.†

Now, setting aside all inferior, though still important matters, suggested by the preceding announcement, is there any intimation whatever in the whole document, that it should be understood and interpreted *otherwise than literally*? or if not so, *how*?

* Though still living in full vigour, as a pontifical fiction, or technicality, as we must now call such things.

† Quo quidem Jubilæi anno durante omnibus utriusque sexus Christi fidelibus vere pœnitentibus, et confessis, sacraque Communione reffectis, qui beatorum Petri, et Pauli, &c. &c. plenissimam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam, remissionem, et veniam misericorditer in Domino concedimus, et impertimur.

There is not a single hint, not a whisper, in a case where misapprehension might, even upon papal principles, be seriously injurious, that there were what are now called *technicalities* in the phraseology, which the faithful might learn from their spiritual advisers, "learned in the law," quite altered the common meaning of words, and that pardon did "*not properly*" signify pardon; nor sins, sins; nor all, all. No: the chief pastor leaves his flock to the consolation, *qui vult decipi decipiatur*: he had his own meaning in *scrinio pectoris sui*. But, says the papal advocate, if there is no qualification in the terms of the grant, there is a condition—a condition!—"contrite and confessed," and (added by Benedict XIV.) "having communicated." Now, not to turn Mr. Green's hermeneutics upon himself, and say, that the receivers of the indulgence might "*not properly*" be contrite, &c. who that is acquainted with the practices and even doctrines of the Italian Church, does not know how cheap and practicable a thing contrition and confession *may* be made in it? Who has not heard of *Attrition*? Who does not know the value of a private, fit, (*idoneus*), and selected confessor? We do not, therefore, hesitate to assert, that, if the above quoted passage, and the whole *mare magnum* of similar documents besides, do not mean what in the ordinary use of language they are understood to mean, the whole is a gross and most profligate imposition upon mankind; or, in the just and emphatic expression of Archdeacon Hodson—A HUGE LIE!

But by patiently examining this matter a little further—and it is a matter of much importance to the whole united empire at this time—we will give Mr. Green and his Church an additional chance of escape.

The world must not be allowed any longer to take for granted what the ordinary run of papal writers would make, or leave, them to believe, that the indulgences of the *modern* Church of Rome are those of the *ancient*, or apostolic, or even Cyprianic age. Van Espen, the first in order of the canonical authorities, recommended and used in Maynooth,* in his *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, has given a concise, but satisfactory account of the different changes, called by him *species*, which indulgences successively underwent, to the number of five; and variations substantially to the same extent may be seen in Morinus; we sup-

* See the invaluable Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, Appendix, p. 450. How well would a Digest of this Report reward the labour of compiling!

pose, likewise, in every respectable canonist.* The most remarkable feature in its changes is, that of its *junction with money matters*.

For any thing we hear from modern authors among the Romanists, we should hardly suspect, that so much acknowledged obscurity hung over indulgences in their present state, not only as to their origin, but their nature, meaning, value, application, and indeed every thing belonging to them. But general observations, which are easily made by the most ignorant, are of comparatively little worth, and may be of none.

It is somewhat remarkable, that in the twelfth century, a great writer, no less a man than the Master of the Sentences, Peter Lombard, in his great and systematic work, has no mention whatever of indulgences; they were but then just springing up. But in the fourth book of the *Sentences, Distinct. XLV.*, there is started and settled a curious question relative to Purgatory, which *was* known in his time, and making ready a warm place for the modern indulgences, when they were hatched, to nestle in. Benefit was even then to be obtained from the suffrages of the church, (that is, the meritorious prayers, alms, and other good deeds of the faithful); and, as these were vendible, the scandal to pious ears was, that the rich man would have an advantage over the poor. The great master ultimately settled the question, by saying that both will be *equally* benefitted in the long run, but that the rich will have the shorter run of the two; the greater number of suffrages will give *diviti celeriolem absolutionem, non pleniolem*.

We come to something more positive, and not to display learning and study more than we can claim, we desire to point our readers to a work of inestimable value, for all sorts of information and documents on the subject before us. It is one to which we have already referred, by Eusebius Amort, a regular canon and theologian of the protector of the Lateran Congregation, &c. *de Origine, &c. Indulgentiarum, &c.* Venet. 1738. It is the most satisfactory book that can be imagined. At page 233, begins a collection of extracts from *one hundred and thirty-five* of the most eminent writers of the Roman church respecting indulgences, beginning from St. Cyprian, who would wonder to be found at the head of such a company. We shall distinguish the authors whom we have read in their own works.

* The place in Van Espen is pars ii, sect. i, tit. vii., de Indulgentiis, cap. i, tom. i, pp. 469, seqq. Ed. Lovan. We might have consulted other writers, and particularly the large volume of Reginaldus the Jesuit, *Praxis Fori Pœnit.* who, we remember, has abundance on the subject.

Peter Dumianus, in 1065, is the first who mentions the redemption of penance by money. Paul, the presbyter, in 1200, speaks of the remissions for dedications of churches, &c., and pronounces them to be of value, on account of the money given (*nummi donationem*), and because the church obliges itself to pray for the benefactor. Alexander de Ales touches the delicate subject, whether, if the relaxation of penance do not avail *in foro Dei*, and the church relaxes when God does not, there is not more *deception* than relaxation, and credulity than piety. Raymond de Penafort appears to be the first who, in 1230, has set forth as the common, and by him, approved sentence, that remissions or indulgences VALENT SICUT SONANT. For this the reference is—*In summa l. 3. de penitentiis et remiss. § 63.* Let the reader keep this in mind. Guil. Altisiodorensis,* lib. iv., *de Relax.*, has the same sentence; but there are six conditions. He, however, proceeds to say, that the church, by her prayers, merits *remissionem culpæ*. He who gives an *obolus* to the building of a church obtains a remission of *pœna*. Henricus Hostiensis, Card., attests the opinion of some, doubtless not to be despised, who hold that indulgences avail *ad venialia tantum*. This is something; for *venialia* are yet *peccata*, and may approach to *mortalia*: at all events, they have *culpa* in them. The seraphic doctor, Bonaventura, in his book in 4 *Sent.*, (that is, Lombard's), has some precious stuff on the *tantum valent*, and records *some* who represent the church as allowing her sons to be good by a *good deception*, as a mother her child with the promise of an apple. We shall hear of this again. Albertus Magnus states three current opinions; the first, that indulgences are worth nothing, and are no more than a *pious fraud*, (*piam fraudem*); the second, in direct opposition, that they avail *simply* (*simpliciter*) as they are declared, without any other condition, expressed or understood; and he speaks of the derision of infidels. He himself embraces the third, which is a middle opinion. *In 4 Sent. Dist. 20.* Innocent III. reprobates the "pious fraud."

The angelic doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, (as commonly called,) follows; and this article, in Amort, is rather unsatisfactory, as, instead of extracts, he has given a condensed, but, as appears,

* We assure Mr. Green so the name stands in our original and in Possevin, although in Mansi's Ed. of Fabricius *Bibl. Lat. Med. et Inf. Æt.* it is Antisiodorensis, and with one s. From Mr. H.'s fate, we may learn that these are no trifling matters. The name is again altered Autissiodorensis. Under all these variations does Auxerre appear in Baudrand's *Lex. Geog.*

fair, summary of the Saint's opinion on the subject; has drawn up his author's propositions from the *Commentaries on the Sentences*. We reckon our own examination more correct. It is derived from the *Supplement to the Third Book of his Summa*; and what relates to indulgences is contained in the Quæst. xxv, xxvi, xxvii. The first of these is remarkable for the conclusion, that indulgences are worth *something*, (*aliquid valent*;) because it is impious to say that the church does any thing in vain (*vane*). The treasury is recognized as common stock, and the person who receives from it is absolved, not *simply* (*simpli-citer*), *sed datur sibi unde debitum salvatur*. The second Article under the first *Question*, now before us, is abundantly curious and important. We wish we had space to transcribe all our notes; but they are ready. The whole is expressly upon the subject which so mercilessly agitates papal writers on their indulgences, *utrum tantum valent quantum pronunciantur*. The conclusion is in the affirmative, with a comfortable and omnipotent *dummodo*. "Your IF is a great peacemaker." The doctor congratulates himself that by his conclusion he has not made too good a market (*bonum forum*) of the mercy of God, as some say, alluding, as is supposed, to his master, Albert, who seemed to affirm the contrary. In the last *Question*, the difficulty occurs, that the giver of the indulgence could not himself receive the benefit of it. It is, however, ruled, that he may use and apply it to himself, not *per modum sententiæ*, *sed per modum dispensationis*. Trust him for getting round to it some way or other, if he thought it were worth any thing!

We now return to our welcome guide: and the first author following St. Thomas is Henricus de Gandavo. The extract from his *Quodlibets*, is valuable as containing a letter of Nicolaus IV., called *Executory*, on the publication of the crusade—*super signi crueis prædicatione exercenda*. It is more rational than usual, but only so in proportion as it detracts from the value and honesty of the indulgence.* The celebrated Scotus is, as might be expected, full of *subtleties*. Astesanus de Ast speaks directly to the *valent* and *sonant*, which he considers under five heads, testifying to the popularity and weight of the question as prevailing in high places, and incapable of being

* We doubt not the authenticity of the extract given, though we find nothing like it in the copious extracts presented by Raynaldi in his *Annals*, particularly under the year 1290. We suppose, however, the letter partially repeated to be a portion of the *disciplina arcani*, and intended for the private use, and justification, if necessary, of the commissariat of indulgences.

put down by affectation of contempt. And he introduces the puzzling question on the case of one who gives one *denarius*, and another who gives ten. Observe the *denarii*. Durandus admits, that the church would be a *deceiver* if the *tantum* clause could not be substantiated. And this, he says, was the general doctrine: though he adds there are three other ways of explaining. True enough, and perhaps fifty. But we shall be told, it is not an article of *faith*, but it is an article of *salvation*, if deliverance from purgatory and admission to heaven is. The Dominican Raynerius recognizes the clause: so does Peter de Palude. St. Birgitta affirms herself directed by Christ to tell Pope Urban, that if she could not get from him without money (*nisi præcedente pecunia*) an indulgence, which she calls a *grace*, she was to say, that Christ had told her, "My *grace* is sufficient for you," with more to the same purpose. Gerson, the Chancellor of Paris, is very rational, and wishes to excuse every thing—in fact, he is elaborate: and, while he attests the existence of the controversy respecting the noted clause, and the enormous grants, as to time, in the indulgences, and is evidently disposed to rate them at their true value, he thinks *they are not to be despised*. The verses, beginning *Arbitrio Papæ*, &c. on the question, why the pope, having the power, does not evacuate purgatory, and quoted by Bishop Taylor, in his *Dissuasive from Popery*, appear in page 203 of Amort. There is a rich harvest of other matter under the following names—Nider, Dionysius the Carthusian, Nicolaus Weigel, in a MS. largely extracted from, Jo. Gevvs, S. Antonius, MS. Pollinganus, Angelus de Clavasio, Rosella, Jo. Major, Adrian VI., Jo. Altenstaig. They are all witnesses to the clause, and one of them, Major, to the *millenary* pardons. We refrain copying from our notes at present, because our readers will probably think they have had enough. And we take breath here, because it brings us both to the era of the Reformation, and to the celebrated Cardinal Cajetan, whom we designate by his most common appellation, without troubling ourselves with the national orthography, any more than we have hitherto done, and whom we have ourselves examined in his own pages.

The principal discussion on the subject before us by this eminent and really learned cardinal, occurs in his *Opuscula*, tom. i. Tract. xv. et xvi. Our edition is Lugd. 1558. He begins with expressing his despair as to the *origin* of the indulgences existing in his time, owing to the silence both of Scripture and the fathers; and comes immediately to the Crusade Indulgences. He was too honest, or rather, with Luther in his imagination, too prudent, not to acknowledge, as he knew, that

the indulgences of apostolic or even ancient times, and those of modern in the Roman Church, were two very different things, (cap. vi.) In the second ch. an indulgence is defined *Absolutio a penitentia injuncta in foro pœnitentiali*. The third informs us that the defining an indulgence as an act of jurisdiction is liable to *many* difficulties and objections. One of the questions here has the recognition of the noted clause, which farther on is given in a new form, of more rhyme if not reason, *Tantum donant quantum sonant*. This is a pretty strong mark of the popularity of the sentiment. Ch. viii. begins with an acknowledgment of the *difficulty* of the question, respecting the *cause* of an indulgence: but the author buckles himself to the solution of it not quite like a true son of his Church, *ratione duce*. The last of his two chapters opens with an assertion and description of the Great Thesaurus, and the author is not a little diffuse and logical on the subject; it may be believed, more to his own satisfaction, than that of most of his readers. We confess that we have hardly heart to inflict upon *ours* more of the ingenious discussions, doubts, and solutions, which flow naturally enough from the fundamental fable, or collection of fables—the *πρῶτον ψεύδος* of papal aberration. Give to Rome her bank, with its establishment, its plated coin and fictitious bills, and she may talk very gravely and imposingly.

The remaining extracts in Amort may be dispatched rather summarily, (although they likewise contain curiosities), by observing, that out of 83, eight notice, more or less formally, the *tantum valent*, and two justify the *millenary indulgences* on the principle of so much debt in canonical penance. Bertholdus Episc. Chiemensis says, that indulgences are not to be dispised, because they are a compendious way to the merits of Christ, and an opportune help to the speedy attainment of eternal life.*

It is remarkable that Amort should have omitted Cardinal Bellarmine. It could hardly be for the extent of his treatise; for some of the works from which he has extracted are as long, or longer. We wish we had room to give some specimen from the first of his two books. He begins with the Thesaurus. On the question, whether the Pope and Bishops can partake of an

* The reader can hardly fail to reflect that Amort, in his extracts, did not at all mean to assist the rejecter of indulgences in any of his views; and therefore many passages which would assist him, may, with no want of charity, be supposed to have been pretermitted, either by chance or design. We were ourselves led to this reflection from the manner in which Saurez is represented in his pages. We have reason to suspect that there is much in *dis. i de Effectu Indulgent.* particularly § 4, which would tell matters worth knowing. See Dr. A. Sall, *True Cath. and Apost. Faith*, &c. II. 200, 1.

indulgence, (vi.), he concludes, (admitting however that the opposing argument cannot be easily answered), that the Pope cannot absolve himself *immédiatè*, but he can *per alium id facere cui ipse potestatem tribuat*—he can do it, *indirectè ut per accidens subjectus sibi*.* Chapter vii. is very observable. The author here explains, as much as he dares, what is meant by the temporal punishment from which an indulgence delivers: but he says it is not natural punishment, it is not civil punishment. He is afraid to say what it is, that is, he is afraid of a test. His double, Dr. Doyle, at his examination already alluded to, was a little more explicit, but still sufficiently guarded: an indulgence might relieve from a particular bodily visitation, but he would not say what and when. The deliverance, however, is *coram deo*, otherwise the Church might appear materially to deceive—in *re maxime gravi decipere videretur*. Chapter iv. on the variety of indulgences, describes, with some approach to precision, the epithets applied to indulgences; it reports, as a solid opinion,

* Meeting with the word *indirectè* here, we cannot do better than notice in this place the quotation of Mr. G. from Dens's Theology, p. 46, to prove, that an indulgence does not remit guilt (*culpa*) *directè*. Perhaps Mr. G. may have to know that *indirectè* serves the purpose of papal policy, quite as well as *directè*. If he is acquainted with the controversy respecting the assumed right of his sovereign over all temporary things and persons, he must know how a right may be resigned, or even denied, *directè*, and asserted *indirectè*, with all the effect desired. Shakspeare was not unacquainted with the knavery and technicality of popish casuistry, as the 1st. scene in the Act III. of *King John*, and the speeches of the papal legate there plainly testify:

“ The better act of purposes mistook,
Is, to mistake again; *though indirect*
Yet indirection thereby grows direct.”

Mr. G. talks of the “much-vilified Dens.” By whom is he vilified? Assuredly by those who ascribe to *him* alone, what, for the most part, he has barely repeated from the *most venerated Rabbis of Rome*. If any allusion is intended to certain foul disclosures, which the pages of Dens have furnished, and if Mr. G. wish to insinuate a stigma upon those who have thought it their duty to make those disclosures public, let him tremble at the just reflection, that the deepest and most righteous abhorrence which he would inspire on the subject, is no sooner expressed, than instantly, palpably, and with all its terrific force, it recoils upon himself, Dr. Murray, and his Church. It is alleged, that *in practice* the clerical bachelors, who enact the part of confessors, are very moderate and decorous in the exercise of their prerogative. But what does the Church *provide for*? What does the Church *suggest*? What does the Church *command*? Consult Bailly, one of the principal Maynooth class-books: then consult Dens, the “surest guide” of the Irish clergy.

that the *plenissima adjungat absolutionem non solum a pœna, sed etiam culpa, saltem veniali*—something to do with sin. Here, like others, the author doubts whether days in this world and in purgatory have a common measure. Some, he says, deny the thousand years' pardon: doubts there are likewise about the common adjunct *in articulo mortis*. Chapter x. teaches, that it is safer to *satisfy* oneself than to trust to *indulgences*; but safest to do both. There are two curious doubts: one is, whether a jubilee absolution, in a reserved case, the condition not being performed, is valid? The common answer he says is, that it is valid, (*rata*), *quoniam absolutio non pendet a futura conditione, neque pendere potest*. Is this a general rule? The other is, if in hope of a future jubilee, a person fall into a reserved sin, can he be absolved? Some deny, others affirm, as Navarre. *Jub. Not.* 34, num. 4 et 6., Cor. dub. *qu.* 37 *de indulgentiis, prop.* 3, and OTHERS. In Chapter xii. appears the celebrated question, *Tantum valent*, &c. concerning which there are *various opinions*; as likewise the xivth and last chapter informs us there are respecting the operation of indulgences on the defunct: *six* opinions are discussed.

We have now done except some reflections.

We shall be surprised if it do not appear to the attentive reader of the foregoing expositions of doctrine on an important subject, by the choicest sons of an unerring and exclusively *united* church, that, whatever else they exhibit, they do not exhibit a "*harmony of confessions*." It will likewise appear, that in the transactions connected with indulgences, there has uniformly been displayed a very sensitive regard to *money*. Denarii, Oboli, and if we go to the *Pœnitentiaria*,* Burchardus's especially, *solidi*, and all other denominations of coin, seem to be incorporated with the absolution of human crime in all its forms and degrees. The enormous pardons contained in many indulgences are not only admitted, however unwillingly in some instances, as genuine, but their very foundation in the absolute discipline of canonical penance is established—in this way proving by accounting for them. For a moderate sinner might soon get in debt a thousand years of penance, for which a millenary pardon was just the discharge he wanted! Would his church, the tenderest of mothers, and the richest in spiritual wealth of fathers, be so flinty-hearted as to see his distress, and hear his supplications, without extending a helping hand, *manus adiutrices porrigens*—especially when that hand would not return empty? But the main inference and improvement from the preceding detail is derived from the repeated appearance and anxious discussion of the phrase relative to the meaning and value of

* To say nothing of the Taxes at present.

indulgences—*Tantum valent, quantum sonant*—in its different forms. And the question, which, as it appears, can only be answered in one way, is, whether this does not express a belief, and a prevailing belief, that the documents concerned were to be understood *literally*. For, in the outset, who were persons to receive these indulgences? Were they the educated alone, who might be fortified against false or extravagant expectations, grounded on the unmeasured pretensions of the spiritual bills put into their hands, by their rather exclusive knowledge of the technicalities of their church, and likewise by their own authority, *as authorised guides in many cases*, to interpret the grants in their own way? No: far enough from it: they must have been generally the *uneducated*, and that at a time when education and learning were inconceivably less diffused than they have been in more modern times, and than they are now. They must have been the *majority*. And perhaps we are not to confine ourselves to that class. *All* the sincere and devoted members of a presumed unerring church must in conscience have gone straight forward to the literal meaning. For consider how they were circumstanced. Large and unlimited spiritual promises were formally and solemnly made on the credit of that church and her highest authorities. Could their church, the sole depository of sanctity and truth, deceive the faithful? knowingly, wilfully, and deliberately, deceive her most devoted children! for she must know, that they felt themselves bound by duty, as well as by affection, to believe, that their great, their divine, oracle would not, could not, *lie*, and lie to *them*! This is just the dilemma in which they would be placed, if even a passing doubt occurred or was suggested. And this plainly accounts for the intimations which rather charily, but still in satisfactory abundance, ooze out from the grave and learned discussions in the preceding pages, respecting *deception—pious fraud—the mother's apple*. In short, the intelligent dealers in the commodities which we have been considering, knew perfectly well how the matter stood. They knew, that a gross imposition was practised and meant to be practised upon the superstition and credulity of those who were nurtured in that superstition and credulity—the weaker portion of the flock; but they themselves were so enchained by the credit and power, as well as the pomp and emoluments, of their ecclesiastical situation, that they supported the delusion—a delusion of the most deleterious description, with their utmost influence; and while, in the face of a conscience burning within them, with the guilt of their hypocrisy, they thus promoted the sweeping falsehood, they satisfied themselves as well as they could, by logical conundrums and technicalities, which absolutely nullified the divine trea-

tures, pompously enough announced on the minor public occasions, but proclaimed by sound of trumpet in what Rome impiously denominates her own sacred year of expiation.

The state of the case is plainly and briefly this. In the Church of Rome, and among its pillars, there are two main parties, however subdivided, on the subject discussed. The first may be called the *Literals*, as the other may be called the *Figuratives*, or (why not rather) the *Technicals*? The first contend that unless their mode of interpretation be adopted, their church must lie, hopeless of relief, under the imputation of solemn and intentional deception! The second answer—not very harmoniously as to the mode—in the best way they can; and truly they do not spare either labour or ingenuity. The looker-on will make his conclusion.

We now lay down the pen for the present, having confined ourselves more than we need have done for proof of *the Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons*, to her *indulgences*, respecting the meaning of which we believe, that they were throughout, except what refer to simple relaxations of penance, a known and intended imposition upon the credulity of the world—an imposition only less put in use in modern times, because there is less credulity in the human mass to work upon.

We conclude with every charitable and benevolent feeling towards Mr. Green, but we might tell him that he will find some difficulty, unless his future technicalities stand him in better stead than his past, in proving, that the middle member of the first sentence of his title, "THE WHOLE TRUTH," has been very scrupulously attended to, in his attack upon the Catholic Arch-deacon of Stafford and sole Vicar of Colwich. Our best wish of all in his behalf is, that he would keep his promise, and for that purpose request the use of Mr. Hodson's pulpit. Nothing would be to us a matter of more cordial joy than thus to witness the return of a respectable member of an erring church to the bosom of a true Catholic Church. He would then be no longer encumbered either with his own technicalities, or with the technicalities of his *Dominus dominorum*, who can sometimes call himself *Servus servorum*. Why, when the door of deliverance is open before him, should he hesitate to enter? Why.—

——falli se sinat

Technis per servulum!

Terent. Heaut. iii. i. 69.

Why *does* he not—why *should* he not—break the spell and the chains; and asserting the liberty with which Christ makes his people free, for ever disentangle himself from the vitiating and destructive yoke of bondage and delusion which spiritual Rome, in her present constitution, is bound to impose upon all her subjects.

ART. VI.—*The Speeches of Lord Brougham*. Lately published
The Philological Museum and Quarterly Journal of Education.

No longer published.

The Critical Works and *The Correspondence of Bentley*. Not yet published.

AT the close of our Article in No. VII. p. 125, we stated that we should probably resume the subject, and bring down the history of the “Rise and Progress of English Scholarship” to the time when its last rays were seen to linger on the death-bed of Peter Paul Dobree. Of course, we are aware that some living scholars could be named, such as the patriarchal Routh, the guileless Kidd, and the laborious Gaisford, together with Bishops Blomfield, Butler, Coplestone, Kaye, Maltby, and Monk; to say nothing of Drs. Arnold, Bloomfield, Cardwell, Cramer, Giles, Rose, and Stocker; and Messrs. Bailey,* Barker, Burges, Clinton, Dunbar, Dyce, Hare, Hamilton, Cornwall Lewis, Mitchell,† Granville Penn, Seager, Tate, Thirlwall, Walpole,

* To this gentleman, who gained golden opinions for his early academic career, and subsequently by the English edition of the Dictionary of Facciolati, we owe a recent reprint of Dalziel’s *Analecta Minora*; to which he has prefixed a dissertation on the Digamma, with a view of shewing, as Bentley suggested, and Thiersch confirmed, that the letter, which once existed in Greece, but was afterwards lost, has been preserved in the great family of the Teutonic tongues. Of Mr. Bailey’s work a review may be seen in the “Gentleman’s Magazine,” from the pen of his old and affectionate master, the Canon Tate, formerly of R. S. Y. but now of S. P. L. Since Mr. Bailey’s retirement from the head-mastership of the Free School, Cambridge, he has been occupied, we hear, upon an edition of the Greek Comic Fragments, which is to be more full than the similar one of the Rev. R. Walpole, published some thirty years ago.

† To this clever writer, whose articles we have long missed in the “Quarterly,” to which they were a no little ornament, we are disposed to attribute the one in the last number, “On the Life and Writings of Horace.” But as all internal evidence, touching the parentage of a paper, has been ridiculed by Pope’s—

“Who can’t but smile,

When every blockhead knows me by my style?”

we forbear to give our reasons for identifying the present writer with the illustrator, rather than the editor, of Aristophanes. “Where no external evidence is to be had,” said Bentley to Barnes, “we must rely on internal alone: and there every man passeth sentence according to the measure of his learning and sagacity.” Be the writer then Mr. Mitchell, or not, we are surprised he did not see, that

and the two Wordsworths, who form the chain between the present and the past, and have given proofs of their attachment to and proficiency in the higher walks of scholarship. But as scarcely three of that number could be selected, as fit to be put on a par with some of the giants of the olden time, we deem it unnecessary to single them out. We will rather wait till the grave shall have closed over them; when, if they are found unworthy of a niche in the temple of Fame, they must be content with the limbo of second rate talents;

“Where Lethe’s muddy waters creep
Midst rotting reeds and silent sleep.”

At the very moment, however, when we were anticipating the extinction of English Scholarship, we find a new candidate has started for the chair of a Greek Professor in the person of Lord Brougham. At the end of the four volumes recently published, and containing the choicest productions of the Ex-Chancellor’s pen, is an English translation of one of the

though he has repeated Baxter’s arguments against Lævi, the MS. reading adopted by Bentley, he has not weakened the force of Bentley’s objections to the vulgate. In the passage alluded to, Horace is claiming for the poets of his own day the same respect, that his master Orbilius could concede only to the older writers, and he adds—

Non equidem insector, delenda ve carmina Livi
Esse reor. Memini quæ plagosum mihi parvo
Orbilius dictare. Sed emendata videri
Pulchraque et exactis mininum distantia miror.
Inter quæ verbum emicuit si forte decorum et
Si versus paulo concinnior unus, et alter
Injuste totum ducit venditque poema.

Now who was the modern poet, that, on the strength of a happy thought, or even a good couplet or two, could bring out and sell a whole impression? Not the Chaucer-like Livius; for he was known only to the members of the Varro-club; nor was Lævius, the Rochester of his day, likely to be put into the hands of boys. There was indeed a poet, a little antecedent to the time of Horace, of small power, but of great pretension. We allude to Mævius; of whom Virgil has sung—“Qui Bavius non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi:” and if this were the word in Horace, we can easily understand that, while Virgil was willing *insectari carmina Mævi aut delere*, the Epicurean more good-humouredly would have told the unhappy bard

“To learn the first of arts, the art to blot.”

The Quarterly Reviewer will forgive us for this piece of criticism; but, as Shakspeare says, “We are nothing, unless we are critical;” while the Canon Tate will doubtless confess, we have hit the bull’s-eye with our random-shot.

speeches of Demosthenes ; to which his Lordship has not only prefixed a dissertation on the eloquence of the ancients, but has subjoined also notes to the translation itself, and there condescended to appear in the character of a verbal critic—a race of men, whom it has been the fashion to decry as the merest shobblacks of genius. We leave, therefore, the reader to imagine, if possible, the surprise we felt, when we found the Noble Lord, after roaming through an Encyclopedia of Science, Law, and Political Economy, at last settling, like an Attic bee, on the thyme of Hymettus, and living on the liquorice to be extracted from a Greek tree, as luxuriously as the French do on the sugar of the beet root.

It was known, indeed, that the leader of the Edinburgh clique, whose earliest and fondest aspirations were to banish the language of steamless barbarians from a world civilized by railroads,* and to leave the half-witted poets and philosophers of Greece as the marrowless food of the bats that flit in the cloisters of colleges, had occasionally put himself into the *Sedes Busbeianæ*, and wielded the *ferule* of the schoolmaster over the heads of Athanase Auger in France, and of Thomas Taylor in England. But that his Lordship, when arrived at the age, when the elder Cato first learned Greek, should turn word-catcher, was an event to be rather hoped for than expected ; and which even now it would be hard to believe has actually taken place, were it not for the unimpeachable evidence of the Ex-Chancellor's own hand and seal. Of the manner in which he has made his *debut* on this new stage, we may perhaps speak hereafter. At present, it will be sufficient for him to know, that we augur every thing fair and fortunate in his favour ; and we venture to predict that he will be a second Payne Knight, who, like his Lordship, was an Edinburgh Reviewer, and no despicable scholar, although he did not begin to study Greek till he was thirty, if the Ex-Chancellor will only put himself into leading-strings, and be content to be a journeyman before he sets up for a master-manufacturer. By turning to Schæfer's Demosthenes, and Dobree's Adversaria, he will find ample reason for doubting the soundness of his creed, touching the genuineness of the fourth Philippic ; which is as complete a cento as the celebrated one of Ausonius, and as decided a forgery as the Rhesus fathered upon Euripides, despite all that Vater has lately urged with an

* An ingenious writer has lately shown that the iron rail-road was probably known to the Ancients, and that it produced the same result of extended civilization, that those of our days are found to do.—See “*Frazer's Magazine*,” April, 1838.

ingenuity, that only betrays the weakness of the cause it is intended to support; for, as the genuine son of Mnesarchus says—

‘Απλοῦς ὁμῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ,
κοῦ ποικίλων δεῖ τᾶνδιχ’ ἐρμηνευμάτων.

Had Lord Brougham gone steadily through a course of classical reading, he could not have failed to remark, that though the ancients are mannerists in style, they seldom repeat their thoughts, and still more rarely their words. We find, indeed, a repetition of the same line, and more frequently half lines, in a few of the plays of Euripides, and once or twice in Æschylus. But in prose such verbal iterations are never to be met with. Even where the train of thought would almost justify an identity of language, especial care has been taken to alter the phraseology. In fact, Demosthenes could scarcely have repeated himself, had his vein been so poor as to be quickly worked out: for as the orations were spoken at different times, neither the events that gave rise to them, nor the words connected with such events, could have been the same. The speeches would, of course, be similar, if the events were so; but in that case, there would have been no handle for the charge of forgery, which rests on the identity of the words, and not on the similarity of the sentiments.

Numerous as are the speeches of Lord Brougham himself—and for number at least Demosthenes must yield the palm—in none of them do we find that the admirer of the strength and the imitator of the richness of the Greek and Roman orators respectively has been compelled by want of matter, or misled by want of taste, to repeat his ideas; and if he had done so, would friends and foes have conspired to consider him as the solitary star of English eloquence still to be seen in the senate, and to which the bar has long ceased to present even the semblance of a successor.

Barring this unfortunate attempt to re-enact the part of Boyle, and to support a forgery even more palpable than the letters of Phalaris, we confess we are ready to receive with open arms a deserter from the enemy's camp, and to consider his former abuse of verbal criticism more than expiated by his present devotion to a science, that offers the only unerring compass to guide us through the perilous sea of ancient learning.* Of this fact every man whose opinion is worth a doit is fully aware; and it is for having directed the whole energies of his mighty mind to the one thing needful, that the memory of Bentley is embalmed

* Perhaps of all the victories gained by verbal criticism over inveterate corruptions, the most remarkable is the one furnished by the Suppliants

in the grateful hearts of first-rate scholars; while all that his opponents wittily urged against him when living, and have foolishly perpetuated when dead, is viewed as the natural offspring of envy and ignorance united.

It is then with no little satisfaction that Mr. Dyce will hear of the impulse given by his valuable volumes to the meditated publication of Bentley's Correspondence, promised long ago by the Bishop of Gloucester;* but which his lordship, too much occupied by the more important duties of his station, has committed to the superintendence of Mr. John Wordsworth, a scholar already known advantageously to the learned world by his admirable exposure of Professor Scholefield's *Æschylus*† in the Philological Museum. Were this article written by that gentleman, and meant to be the *avant-courier* of the forthcoming volume, we should have followed the example of Mr. Fishlake,

of *Æschylus*, v. 674. The passage, as found in the *editio princeps*, contains hardly a word without an error in it. But partly by the collations of MSS., and more by the conjectures of critics, not only have the ideas of *Æschylus* been recovered, but even a *lacuna* supplied in Plutarch, where a portion of that very passage was originally quoted in a correct form. The sneer, therefore, of Mr. F. Valpy, in his truly original note on Soph. A. 1327, recoils only upon himself; where he observes that "if all the changes of all the critics were put together, what a mutilated carcase would they make!" But the head master of Reading school—of whom it cannot be said as of Diomed by Horace, that he is *melior patre*—seems to have forgotten that he takes for granted the very thing to be proved—the integrity of the vulgate. If ancient writers, like the majority of modern ones, scribbled a mass of nonsense, *cadit quæstio*; but if they did not, the attempts, no matter how numerous, to restore the lost ideas, deserve rather the thanks of *Senior-Optimi* editors, than the ridicule of *Junior-Optimi* wits. As to the passages in *Æschylus* and Plutarch, it is probable that Mr. Valpy never heard of them. When, however, Porson communicated them both in their correct form to Ruhnken, that illustrious scholar predicted that Porson would prove a second Bentley.

* We trust that his Lordship will not be content with the publication of the correspondence merely, but give us likewise the elaborate treatise of Bentley on the digammated words of Homer; which Thiersch in his Greek Grammar § clxii, says he saw at Cambridge. It were indeed a disgrace to the society, ennobled by the name of Bentley, to permit such a legacy to repose undisturbed in the silence of Neville's-court. In that treatise, Bentley goes through the digammated words in alphabetical order, and overthrows all the apparent objections to his doctrine. Something of the same kind has been done by Dawes, in the case of the single word *ἀναξ*; and Kidd has pursued a plan not unlike Bentley's, whose treatise, however, he does not appear to have seen.

† Of this publication another scholar has given a facetious review in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for Aug. 1832, conceiving, we presume,

who wisely made his review of Donnegan's *Lexicon*, in the *Quarterly*, the vehicle for advertising his own translation of Buttman's *Lexilogus** But as Mr. Wordsworth is a perfect stranger to us, we are enabled to state only what gossip rumour has bruited abroad, and can merely guess that the volume will contain whatever is to be found in the editions published in this country and on the continent, together with supplementary matter not hitherto printed. It will not, however, we predict, furnish the counterpart of Bentley's caustic letter to Le Clerc, when the self-sufficient and superficial Socinian of his day, required of Bentley to avow or deny the authorship of his *Emendations*

that to treat it seriously would be to turn a farce into a tragedy. Despite, however, the numerous errors of the Cambridge Greek-Professor's miscalled *Æschylus*, the work went through two editions, and for a time displaced the Bishop of London's more scholar-like publications. But the reign of dulness, we are happy to hear, is past; and Blomfield's edition is likely to be still the star in the ascendent; although it is not destined to be the worship of a *quondam alumnus* of the Gower-Street Academy, and at present a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge—Mr. Donaldson to wit, the reputed author of the article on Scholefield's *Æschylus* in the defunct "*Quarterly Journal of Education*." On the other hand, so fervent is the adoration paid by one of the *Magi* or *Magistri* of Oxford to the notes of the Bishop, that Mr. Griffiths, of Wadham College, has done them into English, for the benefit of schoolmasters or their pupils—we know not which—and added a few remarks of his own, we are sure, for the benefit of neither.

* If the *Lexilogus* of Buttman be a specimen of the manner in which that scholar has treated the *Myths of Moses*, as he chose to call the Book of Genesis, we can only pity the unfortunate victim of German Rationalism, condemned to suffer the *Auto-da-fe* of reading the lucubrations of the Berlin Doctor in Philosophy. For of all the books, where the fewest grains of wheat are to be picked out of the greatest quantity of chaff, the *Lexilogus* may fairly claim the pre-eminence. Nor, in fact, would any person, conversant with the publications of Buttman, have anticipated any other result. Neither in his editions of the four Platonic Dialogues, *Crito*, *Meno*, and the two *Alcibiades*, nor in that of the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles, has he exhibited a particle of critical acumen, except where he defends the supplement of the first *Alcibiades*, furnished by Stobæus, and the superiority of a certain family of the MSS. of Sophocles, which other scholars had absurdly asserted to be of inferior value. So too in the notes subjoined to the posthumous edition of Heindorf's *Plato* we can discover nothing to mark a scholar of more than common attainments; although in his *Excursus* upon the Oracles quoted in the Midian Oration of Demosthenes, and which appeared in Spalding's edition of that speech, he gave the promise of talents, which his subsequent career failed to realise; for, like the majority of his countrymen, he began to philosophise, before he had collected a mass of facts.

on Menander; where the snarling cur, who had been the terror of all the pedlars in literature, received such a shake from the mastiff Bentley, as compelled him to feel and acknowledge his own littleness in the presence of a nobler animal.

For his attack on Le Clerc, which, like that on Collins, was carried on under a fictitious name, Bentley never, we believe, assigned any reason. But it requires little penetration to discover that it was something more than an abstract love of truth, that led him to enter the field with Le Clerc, the champion of the Socinians, as Collins was afterwards of the Free-thinkers; two sects as closely united then as they now are, and more so than it is prudent to acknowledge. At least, in 1685, Le Clerc, "whose earliest works, (says the 'Penny Cyclopædia,') had pleased neither Catholic nor Protestant divines, from their tendency to Socinianism, attacked the very foundation of religion in his 'Traite del' Incrédulité,' and displayed (says his Socinian biographer,) considerable talent and judgment in discussing the various reasons that induce many to reject Christianity entirely." But of the talent and judgment thus displayed, we confess we are somewhat sceptical; when we learn from the same source, that, like another person, who shall be nameless, "he published a number of polemical works and pamphlets, most of which were tinged with bitterness and dogmatism; that he wrote in haste, and upon too many and various subjects, having five or six works in hand at once," and that "possessing learning, quickness, and penetration, he was one of the first critics of his age; but it was an age when the critical art had not attained a high degree of excellence;" and yet it was the age of a Gataker, a Stanley, a Pearson, and a Bentley in England; and of the elder Gronovius, the two Heinsius, and the two Vossius in Holland; compared with the least of whom, the Socinian pantologist was a child in every thing but in the knack to knock off a lively article for "La Bibliothèque Universelle, Ancienne and Moderne," the Edinburgh Review of the day.

A similar character is given of Le Clerc by the Edinburgh Reviewer; which says that "he united an excellent capacity with uncommon industry and application;" that "he had already obtained an extensive celebrity by his different publications in the departments of theology, logic, and physics, when his ambition unfortunately prompted him to aspire to the reputation of a collector and editor of the reliques of the Greek drama."—"By the freedom of his strictures, in various publications, and more particularly in 'La Bibliothèque Universelle' and 'La Bibliothèque Choisie,' he excited the resentment of many eminent members of the republic of letters;" that "of gram-

marians and plodding scholars, he spoke with habitual contempt, and thus increased the offence which was merely personal." Of this extract we confess our inability to understand the closing sentence. Surely the writer, whom it is easy to perceive is the same as the Socinian biographer in the "Penny Cyclopædia," meant to say that Le Clerc increased the offence by his personalities; but as that would have been to the disparagement of the person intended to be praised, the editor, Jeffreys, altered the passage in the proof-sheet, and by thus endeavouring to conceal the real meaning made nonsense of the sentence! Had Barker's "Parriana" been published before the time when the "Review" was written, the writer might have sheltered himself under the wing of the Doctor, who in (ii. p. 560), speaks of "the barbarous treatment which Le Clerc received from Bentley, in consequence of the metrical blunders and unsatisfactory emendations to be found in Le Clerc's edition of Menander."

With Bentley's character, however, as an individual, or even as a member of the Church of England, and consistently opposed to Socinians and Free-thinkers, we have nothing to do in this Article. Else we might be tempted to enter the lists with the recent champion of Serjeant Miller; who is described, in the "British and Foreign Review," for 1837, p. 208, as "the true-hearted and determined opponent of Bentley—a Churchman, whose tyrannical spirit was never surpassed, save, perhaps, by that arch-Churchman Laud."

That Bentley was tyrannical, is fairly acknowledged by Professor Wilson, in his splendid article on the Life of Bentley, in "Blackwood's Magazine" for 1830; but it is not as a Churchman that his tyranny exhibited itself: it was rather in his character of a reformer of College abuses, that he showed, what even a liberal is willing to admit, that tyranny is a virtue rather than a crime, when the folly or obstinacy of mankind is deaf to all arguments but those of canon-law. Thus the Pacha of Egypt has been highly praised by the Edinburgh Review for breaking down the prejudices of Mahometans by the strong arm of power; and not only have the levellers boasted of the tyranny of the masses in carrying the Reform Bill—which, after all, they have found to be a mere delusion—but even the self-vaunting liberator of the blacks has taken credit to himself for incarcerating the whites in Union Bastiles by a law too despotic for the Tories to venture upon; who would not consider poverty as a crime, to be punished with greater severity than any act short of murder. The accusation, then, of tyranny comes with a very bad grace from a canting liberal, who, like the cunning Jesuit, conceives the end to sanctify the means. In fact, Bentley ought

rather to receive the praises than the reproaches of reformers, for carrying matters with so high a hand, and for choosing to crush by force, than to conciliate by favour, his opponents, and for acting the part of an ultra Radical by his utter disregard of all that is due to prescriptive rights and to the feelings of gentlemen. But as Bentley was a Whig himself, it is no wonder that he conducted himself to the satisfaction of another of the same party; for we are told that Dr. Parr considered Bentley to be eminently right, and the college infamously wrong; and hence he would doubtless have treated Miller, Colbatch, and Co., as Bentley did, nor have spared the Ciceronian Middleton; if we may judge from his preface to Bellendenus, where the plagiarism of the fiddling Conyers was first brought to light.

Of college quarrels, that lasted nearly half a century, our motto shall be—*requiescant in pace*. All that we can say of them is, that they did mischief irreparable to sacred and profane Literature: for they not only rendered abortive the noblest plan ever conceived by the genius of a scholar to give a perfect edition of the New Testament, but by compelling Bentley to waste his precious hours in hunting down such vermin as Miller and others, the world has lost many a relic of antiquity which Bentley alone knew where to find and how to restore. Enough, and more than enough, may be read on this uninteresting subject in Dr. Monk's "Life of Bentley;" while they who would rattle at a rail-road pace over a bit of biography may turn to Mr. Hartley Coleridge's "History of the Worthies of Yorkshire." On subjects, however, of mere scholarship, it were dangerous to trust implicitly to that lively volume. Speaking of the miserable production—*Infamia Emendationum*, &c. Mr. Coleridge says, it was written by the old Gronovius. Now by the old Gronovius, he could mean only John Frederic, the father; who was indeed a first-rate Latin scholar; but knowing very little of Greek, with the correct feelings of a sensible cobbler, he stuck to his Latin last, nor did he believe, with Horace, that *sapiens rex sutor idem*.* The libel alluded to was written by Jacob Gronovius,† who made himself so infamous by his

* The expression of Horace may be compared with a passage in Menander: who speaking of a sophist says—

Ἄρχων, στρατηγὸς, ἡγεμὼν ὁδοῦ, πόλει
Σύμβουλος, ὃ λογισμῷ διαφέρων πάντ' ἔχει—

where πόλει for παλιν is due to Pauw.

† And so Mr. Coleridge might have learnt from the "Edinburgh Review" of Monk's "Life of Bentley;" where merited praise is given to the old Gronovius for not disgracing the *literæ humaniores* with the

editions of Herodotus and Harpocration, and especially the former; where, like some better scholars of our own times, he pinned his faith upon a worthless MS. but, unlike them, had afterwards the good sense to see and the honesty to confess his error.

There is, however, one event in the private life* of Bentley, which we cannot dismiss without a passing remark. It appears that when he was offered the poor Bishopric of Bristol, now consolidated with the see of Gloucester, the Master of Trinity, who had been the terror of all evil doers, put in practice the precept of *Nolo Episcopari*; while Dr. Mansell, another head of the same College, who never frightened any body but the late Duke of Grafton, and Bellamy, the Esquire Bedall, had no objection to take double duty, at Cambridge during term-time and during the vacation at Bristol.† Now we cannot help thinking that the impudence of the receiver of such pieces of preferment was equalled only by the imprudence of the donor, Mansell's college friend, Spencer Perceval; who should have remembered that a Prime Minister is the trustee for the rewards of a nation,

language of incivility. Mr. Coleridge was probably deceived by the expression of, '*old hornet*' applied by Wilson to Gronovius in "*Blackwood*."

* A most gross, though silly charge, has been made by the Edinburgh Reviewer against Bentley for his scandalous ingratitude towards his patron, Stillingfleet. "The Bishop's grandson was left an orphan, and went to Trinity College as a sizar—but was refused a fellowship by Bentley; who preferred several competitors of inferior attainments." So avers the northern libeller. Now we doubt very much whether the Master of Trinity has the power of making any candidate a fellow, without undergoing an examination; and if, as the count declares, he beat opponents of inferior attainments, we doubt still more the wish of even the tyrant Bentley to prefer the least to the most worthy candidate. In the case of the Bishop's grandson, his exclusion was probably due to his incompetency alone; for the youth might have conceived that any deficiency on his part would be supplied by the favouritism of the master, in return for the obligations conferred by his grandfather on Bentley.

† Dr. Mansell is, however, not the only member of Trinity who owes his elevation to the bench for the good service he did his party on the hustings before the County-Gaol, or on Parker's Piece. If report says true, the present Bishop of Hereford would have been unknown beyond the walls of his College, had he not been as useful in getting a seat for Mr. Spring Rice in St. Stephen's chapel, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been in getting for Dr. Musgrave a throne in Hereford Cathedral.

and not the mere dispenser of personal patronage: and we are yet to learn what service the Episcopal Master did to the State, Church, or even to Literature, except by the perpetration of some epigrams and electioneering squibs, to merit such an accumulation of honors. But though Bentley declined to be a poor Bishop, he was very willing to be a rich Archdeacon, with a couple of livings. Surely the Master of Trinity College ought to feel that he degrades his high office by holding out, as the gods of Greece were said to do, a hand ever open to receive the smallest donation. It is by such pluralities that no little scandal has been brought upon the Church. But till the revenues of the Establishment are so dispensed as to give all a fair remuneration for services performed, pluralities must not only be tolerated as a necessary evil, but may be defended as a positive good, as being at once the rewards for past exertions and incentives for future.

The course of time has now brought us to Bentley, the first in the list of Burney's "Magnanimous Heroes;" and it would be enough to say of the man, who was *ὁ πρωταγωνιστὴς* in controversy, and *ὁ μουσαγέτης* in criticism, that when Porson had been delineating his character with all the massive breadth of a Michael Angelo and all the exquisite finish of a Gerard Dow, a young Edinburgh Reviewer, ignorant of the country of the party thus eulogized, asked, "Pray Sir, was not the person you were speaking of a Scotchman?" "No Sir," replied Porson, "he was a scholar."

Smart as was this retort of the Greek professor, who lived to witness the flippant abuse of sound scholarship poured out quarterly by Scotch *feelosofers*, it is one of which Dr. Chalmers at least will readily acknowledge the truth; who, speaking of the defects of education in Scotland, observes, "It is in the fundamental part of Education that we are defective; and it is in this that we are so much excelled by our southern neighbours; we are weak throughout, because weak radically; a failure at the root is sure to be indicated by a general sickliness, and a lack of strength and stamina, even in spite of the gay and gorgeous efflorescence, which disguises the frailty beneath."

That the young Edinburgh Reviewer alluded to was not of the clan of Donaldson may be inferred from the "Quarter Journal of Education," T. ix. p. 119, where the very sagacity to detect an error and to correct it *instanter*, which was the peculiar feature of Bentley's mind, is thus sneered at by the admirer of men, who can pile up a pyramid of learning, and keep balancing the inverted cone upon the point of a paradox, until they are tired of a *tour de force*, as needless for them to practice, as it is painful for a sensible scholar to witness.

Speaking of the Leipzig and Berlin schools of criticism in Germany, of whom the former, headed by Sir Godfrey Hermann, asserts that grammatical considerations are alone to determine the necessity of a correction ; while the other, under the banners of Boeckh, says that Syntax is of secondary importance, Mr. Donaldson observes that "from the sort of scholarship which has generally thriven in England, the scholars here will probably be inclined to side with the Leipzig party ;" and he therefore feels it due "to his conviction of the superiority of Boeckh's method of editing Greek authors to make a few remarks on the worthlessness of verbal criticism, pursued merely for its own sake, and carried on by a process of guessing, the certainty of which depends upon the sagacity of the individual critic ; while its uncertainty is shewn by the number of Hermann's guesses already eschewed by their author."

Now though the silence of contempt would be the fitting answer to this precious piece of nonsense, yet, for the sake of conjectural criticism, which has done more than all their opponents will ever be able to do, for the right understanding of ancient authors, we will not dismiss Mr. Donaldson without whispering a word or two in his ear.

If Hermann has already eschewed the majority of his conjectures, the wiser man he ; for they carry on their face their own condemnation. But the failures, ever so numerous, of inferior critics, can prove nothing against the success of more sagacious scholars. It is a fact, which not even the sneers of a Donaldson can destroy, that nine-tenths of the emendations made by Bentley and Dawes, on Aristophanes especially, have been confirmed by MSS., whose readings were unknown to those eagle-eyed Grecians. With regard to the superiority of Boeckh's method of editing Greek authors, we can say nothing ; for we know nothing of those models of perfection beyond his editions of Pindar, the Psuedo-Platonic Dialogues, and the Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum. But in all of these Boeckh has made his guesses, whenever he deemed a guess necessary ; and, after all, he has left, particularly in Pindar, not a few passages for the more lucky guesses of more clever heads. It is true that in his two earliest works he was rather sparing of guesses. That was, however, owing rather to the subjects, which did not demand much guessing, than to his unwillingness to hazard a guess. Of these facts Mr. Donaldson would not have been ignorant, had he not been, as we guess, a perfect stranger to Boeckh's books,—with the exception, perhaps, of the Pindar. But as he was compelled to gallop through it at a Newmarket pace, as one of the competitors for senate-house honours, and

prevented from reading it carefully, as a candidate for the temple of fame, he can of course know little about it. We guess too that for Boeckh, Mr. Donaldson meant to write Müller; with whose German edition of the *Eumenides* of Æschylus he is doubtless well acquainted; for he has found in it, what we cannot, the beau ideal of the manner, in which a Greek dramatist should be given to the world; and, accordingly, for the benefit of under-graduates ignorant of German, he has kindly translated it, and as kindly omitted the greater part of the annotations; conceiving, as we guess, the stomachs of Freshmen to be not strong enough to bear the heavy food prepared for them by the Berlin philologist and mythologist united; who, we are told, “has not only illustrated the etymology of the Greek language, and discussed fully and correctly the allusions to the history, mythology, and plastic art of the author’s age and country, but has adopted also the true method of correcting the text,* so beautifully explained and successfully exemplified by the immortal Ahrens, in his immortal Dissertation “*De Causis quibusdam Æschyli nondum satis emendati.*”

To get a sight of a work, which we fondly dreamed was to eclipse Bentley’s Dissertation on Phalaris, threw us absolutely into a fever of longing; while the perusal of it has thrown us into a fit of laughter† from which we have not yet recovered.

* Of these corrections Müller has introduced into the text about 150, “the great majority of which he has borrowed with due acknowledgement from his guessing predecessors; and thus the once inaccessible *Eumenides* may now be read without much difficulty.” So says Mr. Donaldson. But Mr. Thorpe, one of the Tutors of Trinity College, thinks very differently; for when that play was made the subject of lectures, he went on explaining as well as he could, through five-sevenths of it; but of the remaining two-sevenths he confessed he could make nothing; and he therefore told his pupils that they might construe it how they liked, for no translation could be wrong but what attempted to make sense out of nonsense. Verily, the University is likely to see first-rate scholars in the classical tripos, when subjects are set for College lectures which the tutors themselves cannot construe; and wisely did the examiners in their papers omit all reference to that portion of the play which Mr. Thorpe had declared to be untranslatable—a declaration that the Dean of Trinity College and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol might have made with equal justice to nearly the whole of that difficult drama, despite the labours of the Castor and Pollux of Editors—Wellaver and Scholefield to wit.

† The passages where Ahrens threw us into hysterics, but where Mr. Donaldson doubtless finds every thing to admire, are the following, in which that prince of critics has shewn how much easier it is to

With regard to the superiority which Mr. Donaldson claims for Ahrens over Burney, we can only say, that although the scholar, whom Parr considered the third Grecian of his day,

make a bad guess than a good one, and to whom may be applied what Porson said of Jacobs, but with far less justice, "*Bella geri placuit, nullos habitura triumphos.*" In the most corrupt of the plays of Æschylus, Ahrens has discovered a difficulty that the microscopic lens of a German could alone detect; for, in Suppl. v. 631, where the vulgate has Νῦν ὅτε καὶ θεοὶ διογενεῖς κλύοιτ' εὐκταῖα γένει χεούσας—he would read (in p. 27,) εὐκταῖ' ἀτενῇ, and explain ἀτενῇ by *instante*. But ἀτενῆς never has nor could have such a meaning. It is a compound of *a* and τείνω, and means "ever stretching itself"—as in the Sophoclean ἀτενῆς κίσσος, "the ivy ever stretching itself," or "ever on the stretch," as in the phrase ἀτενὲς βλέμμα, "a look ever on the stretch." Had Ahrens only peeped into Mr. Burges' edition of that play, he would have seen that Æschylus wrote, "Εἰ ποτε, νῦν θεοὶ διογενεῖς κλύοιτ' εὐκταῖα γένει χεούσας—" Now, if ever, oh! ye gods, hear me pouring out prayers for the Jove-sprung race," i. e. the people of Argos, who had determined to take the Suppliants under their protection. Even more ridiculous is the attempt of Ahrens to correct a passage of Sophocles, where Mr. Burges had, thirty years ago, restored the author to himself. In El. iii., ὦ χθονί' Ἑρμῇ καὶ πότνι' Ἀρὰ σεμναί τε θεῶν παῖδες Ἑριννύες αἱ τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτε τοὺς τ' εὐνάς ὑπακλεπτομένους,—Bentley was the first to detect the error in the want of the συνάφεια; and, by expunging τοὺς, wished to introduce a Paræmiac. Porson, however, would read Ἑριννύες αἱ τοὺς—and expel the distich that follows ὁρᾶτε; for, said he, the Furies took no cognizance of adultery, only of murder: but if so, who would think of interpolating the passage? Mr. Burges was, however, the first to see where the error lay, and to correct it by reading, Εἰ τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτ' ἔτι, τοὺς τ'—Not content with this neat and certain emendation, Ahrens would read (p. 21,) αἱ τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτε δὲ τοὺς τ'—as if any one, but Mr. Donaldson's hero, could be ignorant that δὲ never is nor could be thus placed. But the highest flight of critical absurdity is, where Ahrens (p. 16) would emend Æsch. Cho. 345. Εἰ γὰρ ὑπ' Ἰλίου πρὸς τινος Λυκίων πάτερ, δορίτμητος κατηναρίσθης, λιπὼν ἂν εὐκλειαν ἂν δόμοισι τέκνων τε κελευθοῖς ἐπιστρεπτόν αἰῶνα κτίσας, by reading αἰῶ, and expunging κτίσας. In support of αἰῶ, we are referred to Bekker Anecd. p. 363. Αἰῶ τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν Αἰσχύλος. But that gloss belongs evidently to a lost Satyric drama, where a person was introduced swearing by Αἰῶν whose accusative Αἰῶνα was made into Αἰῶ, just as Ποσειδῶνα and Ἀπόλλωνα become Ποσειδῶ and Ἀπόλλω respectively in an Attic oath. With the exception of these two proper names we know not one imparisyllabic noun ending in ῶν, ῶρος, that undergoes a similar clipping; while, as regards the rejection of κτίσας, that verb is so Æschylean, that one would rather insert than omit it; although it has wrongly crept into Suppl. 1070, where Bothe has happily altered

Porson being the first, and himself the second,* was the son of a music master, it is quite possible that he was inferior to Ahrens as the arranger of an old piece of concert music. But even if the German's score for the *tutti* of a Greek band were more to the taste of a Haydn, or his learned counterpart, Grotefrend, who set the odes of Horace to music; yet, till Ahrens can give us some proof of his ability to detect the leading theme in a chorus, hitherto considered as a *pot-pouri*, as Burney did in the grand *finale* of the Supplices of Æschylus, we shall consider him in the light only of the little urchin who plays the triangles.

Of course we are aware that all this praise of German scholars is only a remnant of the leaven of the "Edinburgh Review," (Vol. IV. p. 188,) when, in furtherance of their design to depreciate the system of education in England, we were constantly reminded of the superiority of the Germans in those very points on which the English prided themselves. But unfortunately for the credit of the admirer of exotics, Hermann himself, once the great antagonist of Porson, has lately confessed that the *élite* of the English school are superior to those of the Germans. It is true, that whatever requires or admits of prolixity is received more favourably in Germany than here; for with us the first question is about the price of a book, the second about its intrinsic value; with the Germans the order is reversed: for they know, what the purchasers of the "Penny Cylopedia"

ἐὐμενεῖ βίῃ κτίσας into ἐμμανῇ βούν οἰκτίσας. In the Choephoræ, the error is in the antistrophe, which we will leave Ahrens to correct. It is above our powers of guessing. When Mr. Donaldson next appears in print, as the dispenser of praise, we hope, for his own sake, that he will select a cleverer critic than Ahrens, as the subject of his eulogy.

* When Parr boasted of his being the second Grecian in England, he should have been able to point to something he had done for that language. But that, said Porson, he never did nor would do; through the fear, we suppose, of having his errors detected by the very person to whom he yielded the first place. Besides, his mind was cast in too artificial a mould to relish the simplicity of Greek. He might talk of Demosthenes; but he studied Cicero. The polished periods of the rhetorician of Rome were more musical to his ear, than the natural notes of the Athenian orator. Where a prose author was intelligible, Parr could translate beautifully: but a corruption in the text found him as much at fault as a young greyhound at the doubling of an old hare; and though he could relish the critical sauce prepared by a Bentley, yet his favourite food was some metaphysical subtlety of his hero Hermann, when explaining an absurdity or opposing truth.

have yet to learn, that a bad book is dear at any price, while a good one is *auro contra pretiosior*. Besides, in England, a great book is a great evil; for it takes up time to read it; and time, say the friends of rail-roads, is money; and worse still, it compels the reader to think, which the friends of Pantology find to be very painful: for, as Mr. Horace Smith says, in his Parody of Byron,

“Thinking is an idle waste of thought.”

The Germans, moreover, cannot, poor souls! understand how the Iliad is to be compressed into a nut-shell, or how complete information (and who but a superficialist would be satisfied with less?) can be obtained upon any point of importance from a short article written by Lord Brougham himself in the “Penny Magazine?”

But though the German scholars were cried up, when it was necessary to cry down the English; yet, when the gas lights of the new system was thought to have extinguished the oil lamps of the old, then the once admired Germans were ridiculed in the “Edinburgh Review,” (Vol. XLVIII., p. 385,) as “men equally apt to believe and disbelieve injudiciously; to be strangely credulous and whimsically sceptical;” a character which, if true, would prove them to be absolute idiots, and their English admirers doubly so, for pinning their faith upon the assertions of such weather-cock critics. And yet, with all their absurdities, the Germans have not to charge themselves with the stupidity of not seeing that to make a whole nation a race of Patagonian Pantologists is not even, in military phrase, “to mark time,” but actually to commence the counter-march of intellect.

Whether Mr. Donaldson’s contempt of verbal criticism be the result of his own deep reflections, or merely the echo of sentiments broached in a College lecture-room, is more than we can undertake to determine. But we guess that he is only the mouth-piece of a Hare, or a Whewell.* At least we find that the historian of Inductive Philosophy has expressed a sovereign contempt for the researches of a Bentley, a Dawes, and

* Mr. Whewell is, however, not only the great man of the present day, who would make the languages of Greece and Rome as dead in reality as they are in name. For we find that Sir John Herschell, who went to Africa, as Thales did to Egypt, to learn the manufacture of electric stars and gaseous comets better than he could do at home, with all the aid of the Northern lights, has stated, in the “Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine,” that he would dispense with Greek in the system of instruction to be adopted in the Hottentot University.

Porson: and we are asked—What could such men do but act the part of tinkers to mend some pots of the past, into which time had eaten a hole, or of tailors to detach from an old garment a bit of Welch flannel, that a botcher had sewed upon a cloak of Coan cloth?

That Porson cried “pots to mend,” we are ready to admit; but then he did not, like some inductive philosophers, make two holes in mending one; and if Bentley were a tailor, he possessed at least the art of taking off the bungler’s patch, and so fine-drawing the cloth, as to restore the effect of the original tissue; nor did he act the part of the clever Psycho-Theologists, who, in attempting to prove the eternity of mind, prove only the eternity of matter; and still less was he so silly a Professor of Jesuitry as to write a treatise on Astronomy to prove—the very reverse of what he intended—that the Deity is not the Maker of matter, but only its Moulder. The powers of mind exhibited in Bentley’s Boyle-Lectures are equal, we humbly suspect, to anything exhibited in Mr. Whewell’s *Bridgewater Treatise*; while the logic of the *Dissertation on Phalaris* is far beyond what the Professor of Casuistry will ever arrive at, should he live to the patriarchal age of his predecessor Barnes; who was too good a scholar to despise verbal criticism, and too honest a man to expose himself in print as a plagiarist. In making this charge, we merely repeat the language of the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 136, p. 274, where it is said that Mr. Whewell probably borrowed some of his ideas from Comte’s “*Cours de Philosophie Positive*,” a work in which the author honestly confesses himself to be an Atheist, observing that the study of astronomy necessarily leads to such a doctrine; and he has thus confirmed the remark of Paley, who stated that Natural Theology could be better established by a view of the phænomena of physiology than of astronomy; for the former did, what the latter did not, lead immediately up to a first cause, by shewing the providential adaptation of means to ends.

Before Mr. Whewell next ventures to sneer at classical studies, as making us acquainted, be they ever so successful, with merely the knowledge of the past, while inductive philosophy, and especially astronomy, according to Mr. Comte, has for its object to make us a race of prophets, like Peter Murphy, or

Professor Hoppus, however, of the London University, is not such an ultra-Goth. He would not give up Greek entirely, but administer it in the smallest doses possible, on the Homœopathic principle; for the millionth part of a grain, he says, would produce all the effect requisite for a superficial patient.

Francis Moore, let the professor of Casuistry solve the question, whether all the galaxy of talent to be found in the British Association—whose peripatetic movements are simultaneous with those of Wombwell's menagerie, and for the same purpose of collecting pence for the exhibition of the wonders of creation—can predict the course that human affairs are destined to take? or can they calculate even the return of comets, which, says Mr. Comte, are to fall into the sun, and, after they have become red-hot, are to be projected again, and to re-appear, like the stars of a sky-rocket? What can we know of the unseen future but by guess? and what is guessing, but a kind of intellectual hazard? If he will not believe us, let him turn to one of the despised philosophers of the past, and learn from the Platonic dialogue entitled Sisyphus, what Napoleon found to his cost, that the best-laid plans are frequently foiled by circumstances, which no foresight could anticipate, and that the Alexander of France should have said, with the Œdipus of Thebes,

Μῆνές με μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν διώρισαν.

Will all the attention paid to steam-engines and rail-roads, to achromatic telescopes, and compensation pendulums; to anemometers and tide-tables, together with all the phenomena of pith-balls, and the other toys of lecturers on Electro-Magneto-Galvanism, ever enable us to make human beings better, wiser, and happier? A few indeed may become more rich, to suffer perchance a reverse of fortune, when a mercantile hurricane shall return at the interval of every ten years. But the great mass of mankind must continue to toil from morn to night, unless the factories to which they belong are compelled to work only short time; because the steam-engine, by making the supply of goods greater than the demand, has cut down profits to the lowest figure, despite all the vaunted discoveries of all the philosophers of all the *ologies*.

Since, then, the future is shrouded in darkness, while, upon the past, still linger some beams of departing light, which, if no use be made of them now, no art can recover, when they are once lost, we hold that more real benefit will be gained by looking back than forwards; and as the knowledge of the past cannot be attained without paying some attention to the dead languages, we shall continue to believe that word-catchers, like Bentley, are quite as useful, in their generation, as the thing-hunters, like Bacon; nor can we wonder that even a Caledonian should feel a desire to claim Bentley for a countryman. It must be confessed, however, that there is little chance of such a scholar appearing north of the Tweed. Such at least is

the opinion of the *Westminster Review*, No. 31; where, after ridiculing Professor Dunbar, of Edinburgh, for his bad English, and Professor Alexander, of St. Andrew's, for his obscurity, and the late Professor Sandford, for his bombast, the Reviewer refers to an Article that appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 52, in proof of the low state of scholarship in Scotland. For it appears that the *Edinburgh* scribe, in his review of Sandford's Translation of Thiersch's Greek Grammar, actually copied *verbatim*, and without the least acknowledgment, a whole page of Blomfield's Preface to his brother's Translation of the Greek Grammar of Matthiæ. "And thus," says the *Westminster Reviewer*, "it is quite manifest, that in the whole of Scotland there is not an individual capable of penning an original sentence on a work, which, whatever may be its merits, contains nothing but what every scholar ought to be acquainted with."

After thus crushing the would-be Grecians of *bonnie* Scotland, the Southron, in the true spirit of a political economist, observes, that "if the demand for higher learning existed, it would not go long unsatisfied from some quarter or another." This theory of the demand and supply regulating each other is true indeed of cottons, but not of critics; nor can scholars be raised, as cucumbers are, in the hot-bed of encouragement, unless we are content with specimens of the *Flora Critica* of Westminster.*

* At the very moment when the "Westminster" Reviewer was laughing at the professors of Greek in Scotland, he was little aware how easily we could apply to him the Horatian rebuke—"Quid rides? mutato nomine de te fabula narratur." In the spirit of superfine criticism, he finds fault with poor Dunbar, for mistranslating Thucyd. VII. 29. πάντας ἐξῆς ὅτῳ ἐντοχυῖεν καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας κτείνοντες, which, says the "Westminster" wiseacre, is "Butchering all indiscriminately, whomsoever they met with, women and children;" and not, as the "Edinburgh" Professor has it, "Butchering all indiscriminately, whomsoever they met, both children and women." Now though an Œdipus might detect the difference between the two translations, we have too much of the Davus in us to see it; and shall content ourselves with remarking, first, that ἐξῆς does not mean, *indiscriminately*, but *in order, one after the other*; and, secondly, that πάντας ὅτῳ ἐντοχυοῖεν is a barbarism: for though ὅστις is sometimes united to a plural, as shown by Porson's note on Hippol. 78, it is not so united to πάντες; since the idea expressed in the definite πάντες is at variance with the idea in the indefinite ὅστις. The word that corresponds to πάντες is οἱ or ὅσοι, not οἵτινες. Thucydides wrote ὅπου, *wherever*; by which he meant to say, that no place was a protection against the acts of the ultra-barbarians; of whom it were needless to state that they killed all they met with, as if truly they could kill any others. When will the writers on classical subjects in

It was the remark of Byron, that the greatest authors are the most voluminous. The works of a Voltaire in France, and of a Walter Scott in England, are sufficient to form the library of many a Gallic and British reader. So too in classical literature, the numerous publications of a Scaliger, a Casaubon, a Meursius, and a Fabricius, and more recently of a Schneider, a Schweighæuser, a Jacobs, and an Orelli, afford equal proof that learning, like a river, increases in volume and depth according to the length of its course. But as the mighty Rhine, that swells into a lake in one place, is eventually lost in the swamps of Holland, so the most prolific brain may eventually run itself dry. For ourselves, we would rather that Byron had strung together a few diamonds of the finest water, like the *Childe Harold*, than all the mock pearls of the interminable *Don Juan*; and we should be better content to possess an Angerstein collection of *chefs d'œuvres*, than a Louvre gallery of second-rate pieces.

The works of Bentley are not voluminous, but they are exquisite not only in themselves, but as the models for future artists. Whether he would have done more, had he been teased less by the buzzing gnats of Oxford, or the drowsy beetles of Cambridge, and exposed less to the tiny arrows of Pope, Swift, and Garth, is more than problematical. He would probably have been lost in the very vastness of his plans. With the design of building a Ptolemaic library, he would have employed a whole life in collecting materials, and have left some of the pillars so highly polished, and the others

English Reviews make themselves better acquainted with the dead languages, and give less occasion for the sneer that

“A little learning is a dangerous thing?”

Thus, for example, the “Westminster” Reviewer would defend the vulgate in Soph. Œd. T. 250—Ἐπείχομαι δ', οἴκοισιν εἰ ξυνέστιος Ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ ξυνειδότης, against the correction of Markland, who wished to read γένοιτο μὴ οὐ—incorrectly, indeed, as regards the language; for μὴ οὐ are never thus united except where a negation or interrogation [precedes; but correctly as regards the sense, which requires on the part of Œdipus a disclaimer of all participation in the murder of Laius. Had Markland remembered that Sophocles unites ξύνοικος and similar words to a dative without ἐν he would have restored at once οἴκοισιν εἰ ξυνέστιος Ἦν τοῖσδ, ὃ μὴ γένοιτ', ἐμοῦ ξυνειδότης: and challenging the “Westminster” scholar to produce a passage, where ἐμοῖς and ἐμοῦ are thus repeated in the same sentence, he would have referred to Bishop Blomfield's article in the Edinburgh Review No. 38, p. 489, for examples of the phrase ὃ μὴ γένοιτο and its synonyme ὃ μὴ τύχοι.

so rough, as to defy an inferior hand to place them both in the same building. We are, therefore, half-disposed to cry out, with Voltaire's *Candide*, that "it is all for the best," that Bentley did nothing more; for he could have only anticipated the syntactical rules of Dawes and the metrical canons of Porson; while his meditated collection of all the fragments of Greek poetry, suggested doubtless by the two volumes of Grotius' *Stobæus* and *Excerpta*, would have deprived us of Valckenaer's *Diatribæ*, Bishop Blomfield's *Sappho*, and *Alcæus*, Gaisford's *Archilochus*, Welcker's *Alcman*, Dindorf's *Aristophanic fragments*, &c. &c.: and thus the very circumstance of his leaving, like Lord Brougham, nothing for posterity to do, would have brought back the darkness he had himself dispelled, by giving rise to a feeling of despair in succeeding scholars from their inability not only to equal the colossus of Greek, but to measure even the hand that held the beacon-fire of criticism.

It is, then, not so much for what Bentley did himself, as for what he taught others to do, that the world has placed him where no superficialist will be after his death; whatever may be the number of worshippers, ready to bow down to the long-eared beast during its life-time.

It was Bentley who first

Upon the film-closed eye-balls poured the ray,

and taught men to read with their brains, and not, as before and since, with one eye turned to the original and the other to a translation, Latin then, but vernacular now; to take nothing upon trust that admits of proof, but to be content with probabilities where certainty is unattainable; to examine simultaneously words and things, and not as men ordinarily do, words or things; to keep down imagination by reason, until the mind, like a spring under well-regulated pressure, obtains its full power, and then to give it play; or, if need be, to let fancy rove unfettered through time and space in the certainty that, though the mind, like the eye of the bee, may see only an inch before it, still it will bring home pollen to form future honey of the true *Hybla* flavour. Hence, though Bentley was one of the few men whom Johnson said had read hard, yet he never made a display of his erudition but to detect a fault or to support a correction. Hence, too, not so much by the aid of MSS., as in defiance of them, he recovered the very words of the author, by bringing together parallel passages, whose united rays, when passed through the lens of criticism, produced a light sufficient to dispel "darkness palpable;" and though he could have acted the commentator with signal success, as shewn by his

masterly dissection of a passage of Lucan, that Rowe had mistranslated and Collins misunderstood, yet, like Porson, he chose to leave the useful but humbler task of the interpreter to the journeymen of literature—the men who edit school editions with childish notes in the vernacular tongue. His was rather the ambition to imitate the North-American Indian, who can find a path for himself where an European would be lost. Armed with the tomahawk of criticism, and the Abaris-arrow of ingenuity, and the Ariadne-clue of taste, no matter how thick the gloom of the forest he had to penetrate, or how extensive the savannah he had to cross, or how intricate the windings he had to thread, Bentley seldom failed to arrive at truth himself, or, if baffled by insurmountable difficulties, to show others the way to it.

Hermann has, indeed, in the preface to the second edition of his work on Metres, extending to 813 pages, and of which even the Epitome runs to 312, asserted, when comparing Bentley with Porson, that the latter was “*vir tam errandi parcus, quam Bentleius prodigus, audentissimus ille quidem, quod periculum non formidaret, sæpe, sed καίτο μέγας μεγαλωστι.*”

But if Bentley were thus *errandi prodigus*, so far from being Porson's equal, he would have been inferior even to Hermann. That Bentley was ignorant of much that has been subsequently discovered in language and metre, may be conceded without detracting from his character; and though Dawes asserted, and Porson proved, he had made many mistakes in his Emendations on Menander, yet he can be hardly said to be *errandi prodigus*, unless it be shewn, that the errors were such as in the then state of scholarship he ought to have known and avoided; such, for instance, as relate to the incorrect use of the subjunctive mood, as remarked by Johnson, the Nottingham schoolmaster; who hoped to give a dignity not its own to his volume, by calling it “Aristarchus Anti-Bentleianus.” So too Cunningham nibbled at Bentley's Horace: for, like the mass of second-rate scholars, he fancied he knew something of Latin.* But, with

* Speaking of Bentley's Horace, Parr said most truly, that more information is to be obtained from Bentley when he is wrong, than from other men when they are right. Like the Bishop of Gloucester, however, Parr would probably have wished that Bentley had stuck to his Greek. But not such are our sentiments; for we feel that it required all Bentley's powers to beat down the prejudice in favour of the received text, even when at variance with correct Latinity. For instance, Mr. Granville Penn has recently, in the “Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature,” II., p. 154, laboured hard to

the exception of Dawes, none of the cotemporaries of Bentley presumed to grapple with his Greek; and though the tyro of Emanuel gave the veteran of Trinity a hard blow or two, it cannot be said of him, as of the chanticler of Tanagra over his prostrate antagonist—

Ἦιδεν, ἐπὶ τοῦ τέγους σταθεὶς, “Νενίκηκα.”

This attack, however, upon Bentley's prodigality of error, comes very awkwardly from Hermann; who, to prevent others from detecting his mistakes, is constantly correcting them himself; and is seldom convinced of the truth of any canon of his own, until it has been rejected by others for its manifest absurdity. Did we not know the thorough contempt which Hermann feels for the very men who follow in his train, we should say that he would be gratified by finding his opinion of Bentley backed by Mr. J. C. Hare. Speaking of the power of the English school to knock off emendations by a touch-and-go faculty, that, like consumption, is produced by the very air of the country, Mr. Hare tells us, in the *Philological Museum*, that “the English do not arrive at truth by any round-about process, nor by drawing a series of concentric circumvallations, each nearer

defend the vulgate—*Simplici myrto nihil adlabores Sedulus curo*, against Bentley's *Sedulus cura*. For, says he, *Sedulus curo* expresses the force of the poet's personal feelings, and is opposed to the preceding *odi*. But Mr. Penn should have shewn, what Bentley denies, that *curo* can mean *I am careful*, as applied to the master, and not to the slave. Overcome by Bentley's arguments, even Baxter, who was no friend to the slashings of the Aristarchus, confesses “*locum feliciter a Benteio restitutum esse* ;” while Cunningham attempts to evade the difficulty by reading *Sedulus curæ*, which is certainly a not inelegant Græcism. Gessner, however, whose edition is a disgrace to a scholar, from his constant endeavour to bring back the absurdities of the vulgate, so triumphantly exposed by Bentley, says that *curo* is similar to the expression in Lucilius—“*Persium non curo legere*.” Where that fragment of Lucilius is to be found, we know not. He should have quoted rather from Horace, “*Nec curat Orion leones—agitare*.” But even allowing that *curo* could be used in the sense of *volo*, yet *sedulus* would be absurdly united to the idea of a wish, and not of an act. We shall therefore adopt Bentley's *curo*; to which *coro* in one MS. and *oro* in another evidently lead; and this too in defiance of Mr. Walker, who, in his English Annotations on Livy xxii. 24, p. 107, attempts to defend the vulgate, and has the hardihood to assert that Bentley has contributed by his very learning and ingenuity to the corruptions of the text; as if, after all that Bentley and others have done, a single ode can be produced, where something has not been left to exercise the sagacity of men more acute than, if not so bold or learned as Bentley.

to the strong-hold of nonsense, but march straight up to the place and take it; and that it is only when they have mastered it they begin to ask themselves the reason for making the attack; that the Germans, on the other hand, try to pierce into the causes of things till their eyes grow almost dim, and they can hardly see their effects. There are, however, some splendid exceptions. Hermann now stands alone, with Lobeck, Seidler, and Naecke in the back ground; all of whom have imbibed from their Leipzig master the quality of English ἀρχίνοια, and, with it, what the English want, the spirit of sound and subtle criticism. But F. A. Wolf, whom his countrymen hailed as the prince of critics, was seldom happy in his emendations, on which he did not often venture. Equally unsuccessful were the great Dutch scholars. They can boast of a Gronovius and a Heinsius in Latin; but they could do nothing in the way of conjectures upon Greek authors; for while they were extending their reading over the whole field of Greek literature, they failed to acquire that familiarity with any particular region, which alone enables one to see, in a moment, where anything is wrong, and how to correct it. When the Dutchmen do make a successful conjecture, they have been led to it by the sense of the context, and not produced it in the lucky moment of inspiration. But in Porson, Tyrwhitt, and Dobree, this is the faculty in which they peer above their fellows; and if the same be not the case with Bentley, it is only because the other qualities of his intellect were cast in so gigantic a mould."

Of the comparison thus instituted between the scholars of England and Germany, to the prejudice of the latter, as being men who climb the Alps only to get their heads into a mist, and who make use of microscopes until they lose their eye-sight, we are quite ready to acknowledge the truth, but not the cause assigned for it. If the English begin to look about for reasons for an emendation, only after they have made it, will the very clever Mr. Hare condescend to tell us, what could lead them to make it at all? and if the conjecture be a happy one, does he suppose it is picked up, like a five-pound note, on the pavement, by accident, without any attention to the language, facts, logic, and metre of the passage? And cannot he perceive that as the English scholars preserve their eye-sight by discarding the spectacles of the Germans, they are enabled, from their familiarity with a given author, to see at one glance what is wrong and how to correct it? Mr. Hare is, however, more than usually acute in his estimate of the want of sagacity exhibited by Wolf; for though the prolegomena to Homer and the Leptinean oration of Demosthenes contain a great many words written in language as

stiff as the subject is dry, yet they present us with a marvellous small quantity of information; nor in the various references to and quotations from his editions and disquisitions on Plato and other authors, all in his vernacular tongue, have we ever met with a single remark to justify the praises lavished on him by Heindorf; except in the Latin notes upon the Pseudo-Cicero's oration for Marcellus.

As to Mr. Hare's fancy, that Hermann stands alone for the English ἀρχινοία, we do not believe that in the whole range of Hermann's publications—and we have read nearly all of them, with the exception of those written in German—fifty* passages can be pointed out, where the antagonist of Porson has exhibited anything beyond the ordinary powers of a conjectural critic; while in Naecke's lengthy dissertation on Chærilus, the only work we have seen from his pen, not more than three first-rate emendations can be picked out; nor has Seidler, in his editions of the Troades, Electra, and Iphigenia in Tauris, or in his work on Dochmiacs shewn greater sagacity, with the exception of those conjectures where he had been anticipated by Burges. In his dissertation on the Δαιταλῆς of Aristophanes, however, he has made a solitary palmarian correction; to which his other works—but of these we know nothing—may perhaps furnish the counterpart. Scarcely more numerous are the clever alterations to be selected from Lobeck's "Phrynichus, Aglaophamus," and his two editions of the "Ajax of Sophocles," beyond which we have met with nothing from his mint.

With regard to the Dutch scholars, who are said to have been influenced by the sense alone of the context to make emendations, what better guide would Mr. Hare require than the sense in prose? for in poetry a passage may present a very good sense, and yet infringe every law of correct versification—witness the Latin lyrics of Buchanan and the Greek iambics of Sir William Jones. As to the selection of Gronovius and Heinsius in Latin, to the total exclusion of Valckenaer, Ruhnken, Pierson, and Koen, in Greek, the philologist must fancy all men as ignorant

* Amongst the fifty indisputable corrections Hermann would doubtless, and so would Mr. Hare probably, number the set of seven emendations, one upon each play, that are to be found in Hermann's Opuscula, under the knowing title of "Septem apud Æschylum operta aperta;" where, after giving what he fancies a neat and certain emendation, he closes each note with the amusing strain—"Hoc nemo editorum vidit." But it would require no talent to shew that, with the exception of the one in the Supplices, where an English editor has seen the error and corrected it, all the rest contain an inherent defect, which it will be a good lesson for Mr. Hare to find out—if he can.

or as bigotted as himself, if he would have us believe that the Hollanders could do nothing in the more difficult language; as if the harmonies of the Dutch quartet did not make the symphonies of the Germans sound in truly critical ears as the *Βρεκεκεκε'ξ κοδ'ξ* of the Frogs in Aristophanes.

But the most curious part of this exquisite criticism is where Mr. Hare tells us that Bentley was inferior to Porson, Tyrwhitt, and Dobree as a conjectural critic; and this too, because his mind was cast in so gigantic a mould, on the principle, we presume, that *Aquila non captat Muscas*. But so far was Bentley's power of making successful emendations impeded by the vastness of his intellect, that this very magnitude only enabled him the better, like the elephant, with its large but flexible proboscis, to pick up a pin or to pull down a tree; and to talk of comparing Peter Paul Dobree with Richard Bentley, is to give vent to absurdities which Dobree himself, were he alive, would be the first to ridicule. That Porson and Tyrwhitt have made, the one on *Æschylus* and the other on *Euripides*, corrections fit to be placed by the side of Bentley's best, we are ready to allow; but both would have confessed, that they could united only make up a single Bentley.

Like all great men, Bentley founded a school to perpetuate his principles long after he had become a handful of undistinguishable dust. But for his "*Epistolæ Criticæ*" to Mills on *Malela*, to Kuster upon *Aristophanes*, and on *Pollux* to *Hemsterhuis*,* we should probably have known nothing of the "*Epistolæ Criticæ*" of a *Toup* and a *Ruhnken*—those twin stars of Greek scholarship, who, if they have not made a *Longinus* more

* After the perusal of Bentley's letters, 'containing a packet of first-rate emendations made upon the most valuable though least correct book of *Pollux*, *Hemsterhuis* was so struck with his own inferiority as a scholar, that he determined to give up his Greek studies for ever; nor did he open a Greek book for three months. So much for the correct feeling of the man, whom both *Valckenaer* and *Ruhnken* looked upon as the *ὁ πᾶν* of Dutch critics. Had he been an Englishman, he would probably have acted the part of *Boyle*. But Bentley knew his men better. *Boyles* are to be found every day—a *Hemsterhuis* only once in a century. By opening his mine of wealth to the gaze of the bewildered *Tiberius*, Bentley foresaw that he should do Greek Literature better service, than by burying his Oxford opponents under their own heap of rubbish. And so the event proved: for *Hemsterhuis* was the founder of a school of critics, against whom not even England's seven "*Magnanimous Heroes*" can be pitted for the union of extensive reading with a delicate taste, and, their legitimate offspring, felicity of emendation.

sublime, have rendered him more beautiful ; while of Ruhnken's letters to Ernesti, it may be said, that to the recondite learning of the scholar they add the fertile fancy of the poet and the severe judgment of the man of taste. But for Bentley's dissertation on Phalaris, we should probably have missed Porson's letters to Travis ; the only two perfect specimens of controversial criticism, which, in the opinion of Gibbon, the world has ever seen ; and while every page of the " *Miscellanea Critica* " proves how deeply Dawes had drunk of the intellectual stream that flowed from the high ground of Bentley's mind, it is clear that in Bentley's collection of the fragments of Callimachus, Taylor found a model for his own fragments of Lysias ; which Valckenaer said were the two most finished pieces of their kind ; nor, till his own *Diatribæ* appeared, would there have been a similar collection of Euripidean fragments fit, if not to wrest the palm from both, to be put on an equality with either. Nor are these the only services done by Bentley to antient literature. It was he who first put into the hands of critics a test to try the villainous compounds that pass under the names of wines of the choicest vintage. By following the process he laid down, Markland and Tunstall were enabled to detect a mimic Cicero, and Valckenaer to tear the mask from the *Τραγικὸς Ἰθῆκος*, who had assumed the name of Euripides. It is true that two chivalrous youths of Germany have entered the lists to defend the genuineness of the writings attributed to the Roman orator and the Athenian dramatist ; but the attempt has ended, like the aerial ship, in smoke ! Scarcely, however, had Bentley set the fashion of detecting forgeries, when it was carried to a ridiculous excess ; nor is it easy to say where it will stop ; unless, like the great fire of London, it dies out for the want of fuel to feed it. After Markland had commenced by rejecting some of the speeches and letters attributed to Cicero, Dawes followed by repudiating an ode of Pindar. Taylor next attempted to fasten upon Phæax an oration commonly attributed to Andocides ; who, however, found two powerful defenders in Ruhnken and Valckenaer ; the last of whom was the first to obelize some of the minor pieces commonly attributed to Xenophon ; from whose *Cyropædia* he has torn away the last chapter, as unworthy of that *capitale ingenium* ; while, in the case of Plato, if we are to believe the school of Schleiermacher, not a third part of what passes under the name of the Homer of prose, really belongs to him. In like manner, an oration or two of Lysias, and not a few of Demosthenes, have been branded as forgeries, together with portions of Aristotle, some treatises of Plutarch and a chapter

of Thucydides;* and not only has the concluding scene of the Iphigenia in Aulis been obelized by Porson, but even a portion of the first Chorus by Hermann, on no better grounds than those which led Dobree to doubt the genuineness of the Trachiniæ of Sophocles. For such a misuse of his principles Bentley cannot of course be answerable. He merely put into the hands of scholars a weapon of the finest edge. But if, as in the case of Payne Knight† with the Benteleian digamma, critical anatomists will attempt to cut out a cancer carelessly, they must not repine if they are thought to verify the sentiment of Butler—

“ Ah ! me, what perils doth environ
The man who meddles with keen iron.”

Since, then, in every form of sound and sagacious criticism connected with the language, metre, facts, and logic of a passage, Bentley has not only pointed out the road, but led the way in studies that require the rarest union of conflicting intellectual powers, it is not too much to assert that the country, where such studies cease to be valued, has given unequivocal proof of its having retrograded in the march of intellect, despite all its literary and scientific associations, that appear like *fungi* on the tree of knowledge, only when the sap of thought has ceased to circulate in the vigor of rude health.

The wondrous influence which Bentley's writings had on the study of the dead languages, over which his towering talents threw a splendour that Porson in aftertimes failed to do, is best illustrated by the fact, that the whole of the first edition of his Emendations on Menander was sold in three weeks. It was, in truth, only necessary for him to appear on the stage, when all

* This, however, has been well defended by Arnold; while the objection taken to the word *πάθος* has been obviated by the emendation of Burges, in “Poppo's Prolegomena,” p. 174.

† Respecting Knight's Homer, of which no scholar even in Germany but Thiersch, has made the slightest use, we have to tell the following anecdote. Shortly after the publication of the volume, he was congratulated by the writer of this article on the completion of his labours. Oh! said he, rather condole with me. I am at last severed from a friend, whose society has been a source of never-failing pleasure, and for whom in return I have willingly sacrificed time, trouble, and expence. I am now seventy-three years old; and unless I can find something to arrest my attention—to interest me equally is impossible—life will present no charm to the useless trunk of a fruitless tree.

eyes were rivetted upon him; and we might apply to him what the Chorus say to Ajax—

Ἄλλοτε Κρῆς δὴ, τὸ σὸν ὄμμα' ἀποδράς,
παταγεῖ σύχυν', ἅτε πτηνῶν ἀγέλαι
μέλαν αἰγύπιον. τάχα δ' ἐξαίφνης
εἰ σὺ φανείης, ὑποδειςσας τις
σιγῇ πτήξει' ἄν ἄφωνος.

With this feeling of conscious superiority Bentley could, of course,

“Bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne;”

and hence, when his former friend Bishop Hare presumed to edit Terence on the metrical principles first promulgated by Gabriel Faernus, and where Bentley conceived himself to be, like Robinson Crusoe, “the monarch of all he surveyed,” he determined to verify the sentiment of Horace—

“Ille urit fulgore suo, qui prægravat artes
Infra se positas”—

by publishing the very author, whom Hare had stated that Bentley had given up all thoughts of editing, without so much as mentioning the name of Hare, and whose edition he put down so completely as to be hailed by Hermann himself the *unicus Terentii sospitator*.

Having thus beaten out of the ring every opponent, no matter whether he appeared as a stripling knight, like Boyle, or the heavy-armed soldan, like Collins; or with the renown of a veteran, like Le Clerc; or with the ambition of a brother-in-arms, like Hare—to say nothing of the Millers and Middletons, &c. *hostes acerrimos profligare contentus ab impari prælio recessit indignabundus*, exclaiming, no doubt, with Entellus in Virgil,

“Hic cestus artemque repono.”

Cotemporary with Bentley were men who, though nothing, as critical scholars, were still not useless in their own small way. Such was Potter,* afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who,

* A charge has been made by Mr. Kidd, in the “Classical Journal,” No. 33, p. 10. against Archbishop Potter, for passing off some of Bentley’s discourses as his own. But as no evidence has been produced, we are unwilling to return a verdict of guilty. From the known accuracy, however, of Kidd upon such points, we are equally unwilling to consider Potter perfectly innocent, although we confess we do not know where the Archbishop could have been guilty of pilfering from the Master of Trinity.

at the age of nineteen, saw himself in print, as the editor of a treatise of "Plutarch," and one of Basil: and in the preface to which he states that he was then occupied upon Lycophron. By the time, however, that his second work was finished, he had determined to give up all profane reading, in which he confesses he had made but little progress, and to confine himself to sacred literature. Accordingly, he published his splendid edition of "Clemens Alexandrinus," reprinted in Italy in 1745. In his maiden work, Potter did nothing but reprint the treatises which Grotius had prefixed to his selections from Stobæus; while to his choice of Lycophron he was probably led by knowing that Scaliger had translated into Latin Iambics that mass of high-sounding words and unmeaning jargon, when he was only nineteen years old, the very age when the late Lord Royston put it into English blank verse. Potter's talents were, however, of too small a calibre to warrant his firing away like Mercerus, Grotius, and Delrius; who published respectively Nonius Marcellus, Martianus Capella, and the fragments of Latin Tragedy, before they were twenty;† nor did he fail in his Lycophron and Clemens Alexandrinus‡ to prove that the boy is the father of the man; for though the range of his reading had extended, it produced no expansion in the range of his mind.

Of scarcely greater powers, though with much better taste, was Hudson; to whom we are indebted for editions of Thucydides, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the minor Greek Geographers, Longinus, Æsop, Moeris, and Josephus, which last, however, he did not live to finish. In the early part of his career, he had, like Alsop, a fellow editor of Æsop, sided with the party at Oxford opposed to Bentley, to whom he sneeringly

† To the list of juvenile editors, or rather editors in petto, must be added one mentioned by Creuzer; who, in his notes to Plotinus, speaks of a "Jacobus Leopardi, Comes Florentinus, qui necdum septendecim annos natus, neque in Græcis literis ullo magistro usus, ad editionis modum concinnavit librum hoc titulo," "Porphyrî de Vita Plotini et ordine librorum ejus Commentarius Græce et Latine ex Versione Marsilii Ficini emendata. Græca illustravit et Latina emendavit Jacobus Leopardi 1814." But what became of the projected edition we have not heard.

‡ Wasse's copy of this work was purchased by Burney at Askew's sale, and is now in the British Museum. It contains a good many notes, but none, as might be expected, of great value. It will, however, repay a future editor of Clemens the trouble of inspecting them, and selecting the best. There is also in the same library a copy of Sylburgius's edition, with a few remarks of Bentley, but nothing of the least consequence.

alludes in one of his notes upon *Æsop*, published anonymously. But he seems to have made his peace with the conqueror. At least we find that Bentley lent him a copy of Josephus, with the MSS. notes of Casaubon. In his *Thucydides* we first meet with a regular collation of MSS., by the aid of which the critics of our own day have been able to get at the very words of an author, more difficult than, and almost as corrupt as, *Æschylus*,* and who had therefore deterred every preceding scholar from attempting an emendation, except such, as in the case of Stephens and Tusanus, were obtained from the Greek Scholia or the Latin version of Valla. But with the exception of his collations of MSS., Hudson did nothing. His notes are merely the re-print of H. Stephens, or contain a reference to scholars, who, like Stephens, paid greater attention to the scholiast, whom they could construe, than to the author, whom they could not.

(To be continued.)

ART. VII.—*Second Annual Report of the Protestant Association.* Exeter Hall, 1838.

VERY few societies among the very large number now existing have struggled through greater difficulties and against stronger prejudices than those which the Protestant Association has encountered from the very first moment of its establishment in 1836. Yet, on looking to its annual report, it will be seen, that by

* Of the extreme difficulty of *Thucydides* no better proof can be given than the following. On three different occasions, Dr. Davy, the Master of Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, put the same passage before Porson; who furnished him each time with a different interpretation. So utterly hopeless did Porson conceive the attempt to make out that author satisfactorily, that he rarely, if ever, selected any of the Peloponnesian war for University examinations. Since his time, however, and more especially during the professorship of Scholefield, *Thucydides* has been set so frequently, that any fresh-man of the least classical attainments would think himself insulted by having a crack passage put before him, and told not to translate it, but to shew why it is untranslatable. On the continent, Duker was the first to doubt the integrity of the vulgate; whom Valckenaer followed, and asserted that he could correct it in numerous passages. Judging from the few but first-rate specimens of his powers in print, we can feel only too acutely the irreparable loss of his papers by the blowing up of Luzac's house at Leyden. To those, however, who are desirous of seeing how much has been, and still remains to be, done for *Thucydides*, we would earnestly recommend the perusal of Burges's translation of Poppo's *Prolegomena*.

perseverance, by firmness, and by consistency, it has risen up to a station of great usefulness, and to a position of considerable importance. The lukewarm have neglected it, the liberal have assailed or despised it, and those who are mere political Conservatives have discouraged it. Nevertheless it has grown and flourished till the neglect seems to be decaying, the scorn to be ceasing, and the discouragement to be converted into acquiescence, if not into approbation. And why? Simply, because the principles which the Association has advocated are those which the constitution of England peculiarly recognizes; and because, in the maintenance of the great duty undertaken by them, the Committee have swerved neither to the right hand nor to the left, but have pressed forward in full confidence that justice and truth at length are destined to triumph. Political expediency would have dictated to them concessions to what is called "the spirit of the age;" worldly policy would have suggested a system of liberal conciliation adapted to obtain fresh supporters without reference to their sentiments; and, above all, continued opposition might have induced them to despair. They have yielded, however, to no such unworthy impulses. They have neither sacrificed principle, nor compromised the Association; and now they reap their reward in finding the cause still extending in its popularity throughout the country, and the means of working in support of it increasing year by year. During little more than two years and a half, they have, with a very small income, succeeded in establishing a powerful society; in forming a nucleus for Protestant exertions and sympathy; in paying off nearly the whole of the debt unavoidably incurred by the first starting of their scheme; in circulating thousands of most valuable tracts of information fitted for all classes; in publishing to the world, with an authoritative voice, the unchanged intolerance of Rome, as evidenced in Dens's *Theology*, and the other works, from which significant extracts have been circulated; and in operating most influentially on public opinion. We therefore feel that very much is due to this excellent Association; and that now, free as it is from heavy incumbrances, secure as it is of the confidence of a large portion of the clergy and the public, there are prospects of its being fostered into a state of great prosperity, and placed in a high and most useful sphere of action. And we heartily rejoice that such is the case. The time has arrived when Protestants who value the religious institutions of the country, must confederate to preserve them, because bad men have combined to destroy them. We require, in the present age, some centre from which all our effects can move; somebody that can render

those exertions available, a source of information concerning the projects and movements of Popery both among the people at home, and abroad in the colonies, and a watchful, constant scrutinizer of her insidious designs. All these requisites are possessed in the Protestant Association. Nor is this all. The time for something more may not be far distant. There is little doubt that the tendency of events is to the production of mighty changes, and that a very few years may pass before propositions the most alarming—propositions perhaps to pay the popish clergy, to admit popish prelates to parliament, &c., may be brought before the Legislature; and then, we ask, what can be more needful than a powerful, well-organized, extensively ramified confederacy, capable of agitating the country in every town and in every corner, and of giving discipline and unity to the movements of the Protestant party? In such a case, the Protestant Association can start forth, armed and ready. In last year's Report there are the names of a large number of most admirably selected corresponding members; and since the publication of that Report, great care has been taken very considerably to increase the number. In addition to these, there are numerous auxiliary Associations—some of them powerful bodies, as the Liverpool, Hereford, and Bath Societies—all working not merely as contributing allies, but as parts of a well-framed and strong specimen of machinery. If the time for using this mechanism be delayed, there will be more time given for *extending* and *completing* its power; if it be used at once, we know already that it is strong enough to work with great efficacy and with very decided results. At any time petitions can be poured into both Houses of Parliament, addresses despatched for presentation to the Throne, and publications disseminated through the length and breadth of the land. But everything illegal or unconstitutional, everything secret or dangerous, is carefully avoided. Nothing is contemplated which the law will not sanction—nothing is attempted which the most scrupulous can deplore—and all party politics and connections are openly disclaimed.

The question, however, here naturally occurs, "Have you sufficient justification for forming an association so powerful?" We readily admit that a justification is required, and that no light occasion or merely party projects can sanction combinations of people for political movements. Such combinations shake, and perhaps sometimes shatter society, they excite angry feelings, they produce opposition associations, and at length tend to give rise to apprehensions of civil war. We therefore own, that in the case now before us, a strong, genuine necessity—not

simply an imaginary cause or occasion, must exist before sanction can be given to the Protestant Association. But necessity there is—he who runs may read. Nay, more; the justification for forming such an association is so strong, that it entails a positive *duty* on real Protestants. For proofs of this assertion, we refer, first, to the renewed warfare of Popery against liberty of conscience. In Macnamara's Bible, published in 1813, under the patronage of Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin; five Roman Catholic Bishops, many other dignitaries, and nearly 800 priests, we find the following notes:—

MATTHEW XIII., 29, 30.—(Lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them: let them both grow together, &c.)—"The good must tolerate the evil, when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance to the whole Church, and commit the matter to God's judgment in the latter day; otherwise, *where ill men, be they heretics or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance or hazard of the good, they may and ought, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed.*"

ACTS XXV., 11.—(I appeal unto Cæsar.)—"If St. Paul, both to save himself from whipping, and from death, sought by the Jews, doubted not to claim succour from the Roman laws, and to appeal to Cæsar, the Prince of the Romans, not yet christened, *how much more may we call for aid of Christian princes and their laws, for the punishment of heretics, and for the Church's defence against them.*"

REVELATION XVII., 6.—(Drunk with the blood of the saints.)—"It is plain that this woman signifieth the whole body of all the persecutors that have, and shall shed so much blood of the just, of the prophets, apostles, and other martyrs from the beginning of the world. The Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, *for that there they put heretics to death and allow of their punishment in other countries: but their blood is not called the blood of the saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer.*"

These Rhenish notes we beg our readers to remember; these diabolical notes were never disavowed till they had been four years circulated in Ireland without objection; nor were they disavowed from any other than two reasons:

1st. They had been detected and exposed by the England press.

2d. They were therefore deemed *impolitic*; for Dr. Troy, in withdrawing his sanction from them, was content merely to declare, "That very bad consequences had followed the publication; that finding its way into England, it had armed our enemies against us, and this at a time when we were seeking

emancipation." Again, we find, that in 1808, the Roman Catholic prelates unanimously declared, that "*Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be re-published, as containing *the most secure guidance* for such ecclesiastics as may, by reason of the peculiar circumstances of this country, be deprived of the opportunity of referring to public libraries, or consulting those who may be placed in authority over them." The book was accordingly published, and circulated widely among the priesthood. In 1831, the *Priests' Directory* gave notice with reference to the quarterly conferences of the Roman Catholic priests:—"Obeying the commands of the most Illustrious and most Reverend the Archbishop and Bishops of the province of Leinster, we shall discuss the treatise from the author, Mr. Dens, 'of human actions,' in two conferences; 'of sins,' in one conference; and, 'of conscience,' also, in one conference, for the year 1831." In like manner, in the Directories for 1832, 1833, 1834, and 1835, the subjects for these conferences are regularly taken from this *Theology of Peter Dens*; but as the demand for the work was thus greatly increased, the Roman Catholic publisher issued a *second edition of three thousand copies*, with the following advertisement:

"Inasmuch as His Grace, Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, have made it the conference-book for the clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty experienced in procuring the work, as also to advance the cause of religion and morality in other parts of the Irish Church, is induced to re-print a limited number of copies."

And what does this work, so eagerly sought for and purchased, so highly praised and patronised, so frequently used, contain? Let the following specimens speak:—

"Heretics, schismatics, apostates, and all similar persons who have been baptized, are bound by the laws of the Church which concern them; nor are they more released from the laws than subjects rebelling against their lawful prince, are released from the laws of that prince."

"Objection—Heretics are not in the Church; therefore they are not subject to the Church."

"We answer by distinguishing the antecedent. If it means that heretics are not in the Church, as far as relates to the union of charity and communion of the saints, we grant it; but if it means that they are not in the Church as to subjection, we deny it; *for they are made by baptism subject to the Church, and they remain personally subject to the Church wheresoever they are.*"—*Dens*, Vol. ii. p. 289.

"Is it lawful to tolerate the rites of unbelievers? This is answered—First. The rites of the Jews, although they sin in exercising them, may be tolerated with a certain degree of moderation, because from

thence great good accrues to the Church ; namely, that we have a testimony to our faith from our enemies ; since by their rites, these things which we believe are represented to us as in a figure."

"It is said with 'a certain degree of moderation,' because if there be any danger that the Jews by their rites prove a scandal to Christians, the Church can and ought to moderate or even to prevent it as may be expedient, &c.

"We answer, secondly—The rites of other unbelievers, namely, of Pagans and *Heretics*, are not in themselves to be tolerated, because they are so bad, that no truth or utility can from thence be derived to the good of the Church."—*Dens*, Vol ii. page 82.

"Are unbelievers to be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the faithful?"

"We answer, that unbelievers who have been baptized as heretics and apostates generally and also baptized schismatics can be compelled by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith, and the unity of the Church.

"The reason is that they by baptism are made subjects of the Church, and therefore the Church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them by the ordained means to obedience and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism."—*Dens*, Vol. ii. page 79.

"What are the punishments decreed against those infected with that stain?"

"Heretics, that are known to be such, are infamous for this very cause itself, and are deprived of Christian burial. *Their temporal goods are for this very cause itself confiscated* ; but before the execution of the act the sentence declaratory of their crime ought to proceed from the ecclesiastical judge, because the cognizance of heresy lies in the ecclesiastical tribunal. Finally, they are also justly punished with other corporal punishments, as with *mill, imprisonment,*" &c.

"Are heretics justly punished with death?"

"St. Thomas answers 22d quest., 11th art., 3 in corp., 'Yes, because forgers of money, or other disturbers of the state, are justly punished with death ; therefore also heretics, who are forgers of the faith ; and, as experience testifies, grievously disturb the state.' This is confirmed, because God, in the Old Testament, ordered the false prophets to be slain ; and, in Deut., chapter xvii., v. 12, it is decreed that if any one will act proudly, and will not obey the commands of the priest, let him be put to death. See also the 18th chapter.

"The same is proved from the condemnation of the 14th article of John Hussin, the Council of Constance."—*Dens*, Vol. ii., pp. 88, 89.

Once more, in 1832, with Dr. Murray's approbation, a supplementary volume of this execrable work was published, and the additional matter contained in that volume consisted partly of quotations at pages 77, 82, 83, 84, 98, 99, 101, &c., from the famous bull of Pope Urban VIII., entitled "*Bulla Cænæ Domini*;"—a bull whose authority has been denied by the Roman Catholics, which nevertheless is quoted and referred to in

Dens' favoured Theology. One passage from this "Bulla" will suffice. It is as follows :

"We excommunicate and anathematize, on the part of the Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, also by the authority of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and apostates from the Christian faith, and all and singular other heretics, under whatsoever name they be included, and of whatsoever sect they be, and those who believe them, receive them from these, and generally all defenders of them. And all persons knowingly reading, retaining, or printing their books containing heresy, or treating of religion without our authority, and that of the Apostolical Chair, or in any mode defending them, for any cause, publicly or privately, under any pretence or colour whatsoever : also all schismatics and those who pertinaciously withdraw themselves or recede from our obedience and that of the Roman Pontiff for the time being."

In other parts of this supplemental book for popish conferences, we meet with recognitions of the persecuting bull of Benedict XIII. in 1725 ; that of Clement XII. in 1734 ; those of Benedict XIV. in 1750 and 1751 : all which sanction *torture* ; and the following among other similar passages :

"The Bishop is bound, even in places where the Holy Inquisition is in force, to take sedulous care that he should purge the diocese entrusted to him of heretics ; and if he shall find any, he ought to visit him with canonical punishments : nevertheless he ought to take care that he shall not hinder the inquisitors of the faith from doing their office."—*Dens*, Vol. viii., page 88.*

We believe, that if not another line could be quoted against Popery, these publications alone would justify confederation on Protestant principles. But more remains to be adduced ; more bigotry might be quoted, more malignity might be brought forward, and worse assaults on the rights and consciences of mankind. From all these disgusting emanations of Popish rancour we refrain ; and pass on to the second main ground of justification, namely, the present political power and progress of Romanism in Europe and in Great Britain.

And on this great point, it is now needless to enlarge ; the truth is too well known to require fresh minute development. Popery has our senate in her grasp, and turns the scale between the contending political parties ; at Court she has en-

* For much of the matter we have quoted, we have referred to a most admirable analysis against the Papacy in "*The Address of the Protestant Association*," in 1836, being Number VI. of their publication. It is an exceedingly clear and powerful pamphlet ; its price only twopence.

croached by well-calculated and important processes ; in Ireland, in Great Britain, and in the colonies, she numbers among those whom the Queen delighteth to honour, and who govern their fellow-subjects, numerous influential partizans. The Navy and the Army are filled with Papists ; judicial stations are entrusted to them ; and the system of national education, as established in Ireland and proposed for England, designs, for popish purposes, the mutilation of the Bible, and the corruption of the rising generation ! Meanwhile, the Church is discouraged, its ministers are persecuted, robbed, and subjected to every species of secular interference and controul ; the Christian missionaries in the colonies are thwarted by priests of Rome, paid, together with their bishops, by the public or domestic legislatures ; and a spurious liberalism is gradually undermining the foundations of society, and loosening its bonds. In Europe, the case is the same. Popery is agitating Austria, Prussia, Holland, and Hanover, and in each of those countries is opposing and overbearing Protestantism. In the United States, by the aid of the boasted voluntary principle, the Romanists are fast and successfully progressing ; and in Canada, they are diligently co-operating with the revolutionists to effect the dissolution of the connection with Protestant England !

These, then, are the justifications of the Protestant Association ; these are the impelling causes of that confederation which sincere and zealous Protestants have formed. Better justifications, more urgent reasons, more powerful considerations, cannot possibly be alleged. Self-defence is the only principle on which the Society is founded. But how far, it will be asked, is that principle adhered to in its operations ? Is it not true that the Committee have proceeded in an aggressive spirit by petitioning for the repeal of the Emancipation Act ? They have, we admit, and rejoice to admit it, so petitioned ; but they have not, by so doing, departed from the defensive line of action originally proposed for their guidance. Their petition is simply a declaration that Papists in Parliament have broken the compact which secured their seats, have violated solemn obligations, and assailed the most valuable national institutions, in defiance of pledges the most distinct, and promises repeatedly made and publicly recorded. They complain chiefly of *fraud* ; and they ask merely for that justice, for that result, which broken conditions give them a right to claim. If their demand were for more, or were for the imposition of penalties and restrictions, such as did not exist before the Emancipation Act ; or, if they sought to seize popish property, to interfere with the regulations and discipline of the Romish ecclesiastics, then indeed, in any such case, an aggressive spirit might be charged upon them, even if

their ultimate object were strictly defensive, and those measures were desired only as precautions. But now the Protestant Association, and all who have followed out the same policy, do no more than take advantage of certain violations of the compact and conditions by which popery gained its legislative power, to renew the objection, in principle, to national connection with Romanism, and to seek a return to that position in which the Papists were placed previously to their acquiring, by false pretences, their present authority. And this, be it remembered, was not done till common sense and common prudence called imperatively for such a movement. It was not done when O'Connell was agitating at Dissenters' meetings, in 1834, for the total separation of Church and State; it was not done when, in the year previously, he and his mymidons voted for abolishing ten Bishoprics in Ireland, for taxing benefices and extinguishing church cess; it was not done when he joined in assailing our Universities, when he succeeded in supplanting the Protestant system of Irish education by a Popish plan calculated to consummate the sin of our national apostacy. On all these occasions, notwithstanding the heavy provocation afforded by them, no petition was presented, and no agitation was commenced. It was the appropriation clause, the infamous and now sneakingly-deserted offspring of the Lichfield-house alliance, the modest and liberal proposal for the destruction of Protestantism in 850 parishes of Ireland, that first caused Protestants to awake from their lethargy; to unite, and to demand protection and defence by the ejection from Parliament of those who had sworn to uphold the very institutions they were then and are now foremost in assailing. And we appeal to any candid and fair-judging man, if there were not cause and justification for the attempt? Are we indeed to go on conceding and conceding, till no more is left to concede, and nothing to enjoy? Are we to sit quiescent and silent while all that we hold dear is sacrificed or betrayed, and while popery is boldly and wickedly throwing to the winds her professions, and trampling on her repeated oaths? It may suit some to call it bigotry, and others to call it persecution, and some more to style it aggression, when Protestants unite to *petition*, and, if need be, to *agitate*, for that protection to their establishments which the very words of the popish declaration and of the Emancipation Act guarantee; but we may be excused if we distrust the men who can cavil at so needful a proceeding. We believe that in that distrust we are joined by most of the clergy, and by a large body of the most respected classes of the laity; and, therefore, we are confident that the Protestant Association may go forward, spurning the dictates of

worldly expediency, in that support of manly policy which alone can secure the remnant of the British Constitution.

If, then, this measure be approved, all the other minor operations of the Society will readily be sanctioned ; for no one who consents to endeavours to restore the Protestant character of the Legislature, will stop short at assaults on the grants and on the proposal for increased votes to Maynooth College, or at opposition to any clauses such as were proposed last session, and are to be proposed again for the appointment and payment of Popish Chaplains to the largest English prisons ; or at struggles against the endowment of Popish Bishops and Priests in the Colonies ; or at protests against Popish participation in the management of any system of national education. The only question that can arise in the mind of any man well affected to the Protestant cause, refers not to the propriety of operating against Popish institutions or schemes, but anxiously to the means at the command of the Protestant Association for carrying out the necessary opposition or resistance : and this doubtless is a point on which the public is entitled to full information ; but the answer to which, it must not be forgotten, depends much on their own liberality and zeal. At present, the Association works by various processes, the extent and vigour of which are only limited by want of more pecuniary aid. On reference to last year's Report, now before us, we find that these measures are, principally, public meetings, publications, and petitions. Of the public meetings, it is stated, that they were held at Exeter Hall on thirteen occasions, in Marylebone, and Westminster, in London ; at Kennington, Hatcham, Blackheath, Hackney, Peckham, and Camberwell, in the suburbs ; and in Edinburgh, Liverpool, Bath, Hereford, Bristol, Guildford, Clare, Gosport, Warrington, &c. Of the publications, seventy thousand were distributed ; and these being chiefly comprehensive, elaborate, and important pamphlets, were calculated to produce a considerable impression. In the list of the productions chiefly circulated, we may name the address to which we have already alluded in a note ; Dr. Croly's " England the Fortress of Christianity," " The Progress of Popery," from Blackwood's Magazine," " The Speech of Mr. Colquhoun, M.P. on the Maynooth College grant," the " Rev. Mr. M'Ghee's Pamphlets on the Rhemish Notes, and on the Doctrines of the Romish Bishops in Ireland," the " Bishop of Exeter's Speech on the Roman Catholic Oath," and " A Few Facts to awaken Protestants." All of these we can recommend to our readers, believing them well calculated to diffuse a great deal of most important and striking information on deeply interesting subjects. Of the

petitions, it is only needful to state, that they were severally for the exclusion of Roman Catholics from Parliament, against the grant to the Maynooth College, for the redress of Protestant grievances, and against the appointment of Popish Chaplains under the New Prisons Bill. Many of these came from very important districts, and we understand that their number and the number of the signatures attached to them will most probably be more than doubled during the next session of Parliament. It was with some difficulty that about 12,000 signatures against Maynooth were obtained last session; but the improved state of the Association's machinery promises a far greater movement for the future. Among the other newly-adopted modes of extending the necessary operations, we have noticed, with great pleasure, in some of the newspapers an advertisement for a separate fund for the establishment of a travelling agency; and from the remarkably prompt and liberal manner in which the application for contributions has been met, we feel justified in auguring well of the success of the scheme, and of the Protestant feeling throughout the country, on which it is to operate. On the whole, therefore, we trust that as the field of exertion opens and expands, the Protestant Association will be found adequate to the performance of the great duty with which it seems entrusted; and in its efforts it will certainly receive from us, and we trust also from a considerable portion of the clergy, sympathy and aid.

Under ordinary circumstances, we should feel bound to apologize to our readers for thus prominently introducing to them a particular Society; but in the present case, viewing the aspect of public affairs, and believing the Protestant Association to be well calculated to meet and contend with some serious evils, we feel that we have all excuses anticipated and over-ruled. Without then enlarging on this subject, we will conclude with stating briefly our object in investigating, as we have done, the principles and the movements of this Association; and in thus specially defending it, and recommending it to the support of the clergy of the Church of England. The object is to obtain the aid and sanction of the class whose comparative negligence of the Association has tended very materially to weaken and discourage it. Some of the clergy, indeed, and those very much respected individuals, have joined and approved it, and thus have assisted in mitigating the suspicion which the total absence of clergymen would have justly occasioned. We may mention, for instance, Dr. Croly, Mr. Faber, Mr. Benson, Mr. Bickersteth, Dr. Kenny, Dr. Ellerton, Dr. M'Caul, the Honourable Mr. Powys, Mr. Pratt, Mr. Watkins, &c. &c. Yet still it must

be evident that more clerical sanction is necessary to impart to the Association the only character which can permanently secure public confidence, and give weight to its movements against the popish attacks on the Church. Of this sanction, we hope the Association in its past operations has proved itself worthy; nor, in the present times, should it be denied to any useful body without great reason, or withdrawn without adequate considerations. We believe we may assert that hitherto those among our clerical friends who have given their aid, have never seen any cause to regret the step, and have witnessed no compromise of the principle of the Establishment by the Committee. We know that that body is anxious to receive clerical co-operation, and to act, as far as possible, on the advice of those clerical members by whom their movements have been assisted; and we therefore recommend the matter to the attention of our readers, earnestly recommending them to regard with care the signs of the times, and to weigh with seriousness the necessity for combinations against the inroads and the political power of the Popish party. Unhappily in the country, and not less among the clergy as a class, great apathy has existed, and the result has been seen in the incessant conspiracies against the Church and the Constitution, and in the success of many of the plans for the advancement of Popery. But we sincerely trust and believe that this apathy is now departing, and that the people are commencing to rouse themselves in defence of ancient principles and time-honoured institutions. And if this belief be well grounded, we shall confidently expect success, and fear no evil. Nothing more is needed than that those who value our Protestant Constitution, should be true to their cause and to themselves. If they be, their opponents of all sorts, political dissenters, papists, and infidels, and treacherous and pretended Churchmen may confederate, and agitate, and clamour; but certain it is that they will fail in their efforts, and be conquered in the struggle. Yet combination must be opposed to combination, and union to union. If that be done, we repeat, that the cause of Protestantism will triumph, and that the great bulwarks of Christianity in this land, the ecclesiastical institutions, will roll back the assailing flood designed to overturn and destroy them.

PROTESTANT WORKS.

- ART. VII.—1. *The Churches of Rome and England compared in their declared Doctrines and Practices.* By RICHARD MANT, D.D., Bishop of Down and Connor. London: Parker. 1838.
2. *The Church of England a Faithful Witness against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome.* By the Rev. R. MEEK. London: Hatchard. 1834.
3. *Protestantism the Old Religion—Popery the New; or Protestantism as old as the Bible, and Popery the Corruption of the Seventh Century.* By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. Bath. 1838.
4. *The Variations of Popery.* By SAMUEL EDGAR. Second Edition. London: Seeley. 1838.

ROMAN CATHOLIC WORKS.

1. *The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrines contained in the Profession of Faith published by Pope PIUS IV.* London: Cuddon.
2. *An Abstract of the Douay Catechism: revised, improved, and recommended, by authority, for the use of the Faithful, in the four districts of England.* London: 1837.
3. *An Essay on the Principles and Practices of the Catholic Church.* London: Booker. 1838.

THE following Article contains an imaginary conversation between a Clergyman of the Church of England, and a Roman Catholic Priest, and is intended to be carried on through several numbers of this Periodical, and then reprinted in a separate form for distribution, under the title of *The Protestant Tracts*. The discussion will embrace the leading topics of difference existing between the Anglican and Roman Churches. To avoid all misrepresentations of the faith and practices of the Church of Rome, the voice of her own creed, settled by the Council of Trent, as the acknowledged and authoritative standard, relative to doctrines, shall be heard, and her *professions of faith* shall be introduced on acknowledged authorities. In many discussions, especially those which have taken place between Protestants and Roman Catholics, the latter have complained that the former impute doctrines and practices which do not belong to them; but the plan, which the author of these dialogues has fixed upon, will preclude such accusations. All shall be genuine, all shall be fairly and candidly discussed, not

in an evil spirit, but in the spirit of love and Christian charity, and with the sole desire of extending the blessings of the Gospel, which we as Protestants enjoy, to those whose faith, in very many respects, differs from the *faith delivered* by Christ himself *to the saints*, and of uniting men in the bond of peace and love, which are the pure and characteristic fruits of Christianity.

After a formal introduction and a short conversation upon some topics of an ordinary nature, the following dialogue is supposed to have taken place.

Clergyman.—It is indeed a point of very serious importance, that so wide a disagreement should exist between men who have or ought to have one common object in view. Ever since the period of the Reformation, when the separation took place, between your Church and my Church, that disagreement has been marked in your separate practice. It may not be uninteresting to us to examine in what that difference consists. The result of such an enquiry is of extreme importance. For if that difference be small—if the Churches of England and Rome agree together in all the fundamental articles of Christianity—the Reformation of Religion in this kingdom is justly chargeable with folly and impiety; our Reformers have shed their blood for a chimera; and our Church has been guilty of establishing, and is at this time guilty of maintaining, an unchristian schism, which it would be her duty to acknowledge and to repair; but if the difference be well founded, and we are authorized in it by the Scriptures, it behoves us all, whether clerical or lay members of our reformed Church, the United Church of England and Ireland, to cherish the memory of the Reformation as a signal blessing from the good providence of God; to hallow our Reformers in our remembrance as martyrs to the truth of God's holy word; and to be ready on all fit occasions, with Christian moderation and charity indeed, but nevertheless with Christian simplicity and firmness, to plead and contend earnestly for the faith of the Church, as transmitted to us from our forefathers, and to set forth the true character of that Church from which they were, and we still are, constrained to live in a state of separation.*

Rom. Cat. Priest.—With you, I admit the differences existing between our Churches to be very great, and the existence of those differences I conceive with you to be a point of the most serious importance; I therefore gladly avail myself of the oppor-

* See the Churches of Rome and England compared. By Bishop Mant.

tunity of discussing them, in the hopes that some good effects may be elicited from the observations and arguments we each may be inclined to use. Although I am a Roman Catholic, I do not profess to be bigoted to that faith which I have been taught in my youth, and which I have cherished in my age. That faith I conceive to be founded both on the Holy Scriptures and upon Tradition: that faith has forbidden me from attending to the zealous persuasions of many of your brethren to become a Protestant.

Clergyman.—Before we enter upon the discussion of the fundamental articles of our Churches, will you first be kind enough to state your reasons why you could not conform to the Protestant religion.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—I entertain many reasons, each of which I will candidly offer to your consideration; and if you please, we will discuss them individually.

1st. Because the Protestant religion is a new religion, which had no being in the world till 1500 years after Christ: therefore, it came 1500 years too late to be the true Church of Christ. Martin Luther laid the first foundation of the Protestant religion, in the year 1517; and his followers took the name of Protestants in the year 1529, before which time, neither the name nor the religion was ever heard of in the Christian world. And I defy all the learned men amongst them to name so much as one single name before Luther, who held throughout either the thirty-nine articles of your Church, or any other entire system of Protestancy, as it is now professed in any country upon earth. Now, how can that be Christ's Church, which for so many ages had no being in the world; since all Christians are obliged to acknowledge, that the true Church of Christ can only be that which dates its beginning from Christ, that which he promised should stand for ever?

Clergyman.—The first point of difference is certainly immense. And the difference appears to rest upon the *antiquity* of our two Churches. Now before we proceed to argument, one of us must be prepared to yield; and the palm must be given to him who can establish the antiquity of his Church; for upon that antiquity the present point must rest.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—Decidedly; I agree to your proposition.

Clergyman.—Propound then your arguments.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—Both of us must admit that a body of teaching men was established by the Saviour, and that positive authority to decide controversies is a necessary consequence of their mission; if so, it must be the exclusive privilege of that Church, which can trace its priesthood and doctrine from the

Apostles, and at once proves, that the pretensions of all others to teach in opposition to it, are without the slightest foundation.

Clergyman.—To that I readily assent.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—This exclusive authority the Church, of which the Pope is the acknowledged head, claims and refers to the continued existence of its priesthood and doctrine from the Apostles as evidence of such right; and declares that the Churches in communion with the see of Rome alone constitute the true Catholic or Universal Church established by the Saviour.

Clergyman.—Now then we arrive at one of the main points of the difference between us; but proceed.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—I am quite aware that this claim is denied by those who oppose the authority, of the (Roman) Catholic Church, by whom it is charged with errors in doctrine and pretension to authority, for which there is no foundation in the sacred writings; they also maintain that all the reformed Churches are branches of the true Church, and that at the Reformation they only separated from the corrupt Church of Rome, and not from the true Church of Christ.

But the Church is necessarily a society composed of teachers and followers of the doctrine of the Saviour, and not an imaginary union of distinct bodies, whose sole standard of doctrine is their own individual conviction.

Either then the Church in communion with the see of Rome (from which all who deny its authority acknowledge they parted) is the true Church or it is not. If it be the true Church, then why did you separate from it? If not, where then is the true Church? And did you on leaving the Church of Rome, join a particular society, or did you not rather separate yourselves from all other societies, declaring yourselves equally independent of them all?—unless, indeed, we have recourse to the hypothesis of an invisible Church, or an imaginary union of all professing belief in the Saviour.

The only mode, by which this dilemma is sought to be refuted, is the assertion that the Church of Rome preserved the essentials of Christianity, though it also inculcated as terms of communion errors in faith and practice, *which alone they rejected*; but to say that it erred in any one point, is to declare the Church of Rome was not the true Church at the time of their separation; whereas, what is required is to shew another visible society of Christians, which was the true Church on earth at that time; and that is required without having recourse to the expedient of an invisible Church, which is opposed not only to

the character of the Church described in holy writ, but to the very essence of its mission, and to the principal end of its establishment; viz. to teach and direct all nations, and unite all mankind in one faith.*

Clergyman.—Well, what you have just stated contains but one broad assertion, unaccompanied by positive proof or stringent argument. Your words are more shadowy than substantial; they beg the question, but produce no foundation on which the question itself can rest. It is much easier to assert things than to prove them, much easier to claim a remote antiquity than to exhibit the chain of antiquity in a series of unbroken links; and this is the predicament in which you stand. I know that it is common with the Roman Catholics in general to boast of the antiquity of their Church. In nine cases out of ten in which you have been successful in seducing individuals from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism, you have succeeded by means of this fallacy. Other attempts are made to convert Protestants, but this is the great gun by which the breach is attempted to be made. But it will be very easy to shew that your boast of antiquity is a mere pretence.†

You assert that the Protestant religion is a new religion, which had no being in the world till 1500 years after Christ. Now I am prepared to disprove your assertion, and to shew that the religion held and propagated by the Church of England is in identity and substance that which was founded by Christ himself and extended by his holy Apostles; and that it was the Church, such as you now see the Church of England, and not the Church of Rome, that our Saviour built upon a rock, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. The only thing that is new in Protestantism is the name, but I look upon the name as a matter of small importance: I glory in the principles, that the name implies. Our principles and doctrines are as old as Christianity itself; and they are contained in the Bible. The name of Protestant is adopted in contradistinction to papists, and is applied to those who oppose and *protest* against the errors of the Church of Rome.

But because the term *Protestant* was not used before the Reformation (and how could it have been used before the event which caused it!), you slip away from the main argument, and fasten on an accident; you, illogically assuming that Protes-

* See an Essay on the Principles and Practices of the (Roman) Catholic Church.

† See an admirable tract, entitled, *Protestantism the Old Religion, Popery the New, or Protestantism as old as the Bible and Popery the Corruption of the Seventh Century.* By the Rev. T. Lathbury, M.A.

tantism implies a new religion, seek to enforce on your hearers the conclusion, that the doctrines of the Protestants must be of the same comparatively recent date as the name. This is neither liberal nor candid, and the cause which requires the prop of such distorted reasoning becomes immediately open to suspicion. Now listen to facts which are not to be frittered away, and to arguments which are not to be controverted.

Protestantism comprises three things. These are, the Name, the Faith, and the Church, or in other terms, the Appellation, the Profession, and the People. The name, all admit, is, in this acceptation, a novelty, which originated in the sixteenth century, and as late as the days of Luther. The patrons of the Reformation in Germany *protested*, in 1529, against the unjust decision of the Diet of Spire, and in consequence were called Protestants. An old institution, therefore, came to be distinguished by a new appellation. Protestantism, in its modern and ecclesiastical application, began to signify Christianity.

But changing the sign does not change the signification. Britain, according to the ancient appellation, is now called England, without any change in the territory; the ancients called that Irene and Hibernia which the moderns call Ireland. France was formerly named Gaul, and Columbia lately Terra Firma; whilst these divisions of the European and American continents, notwithstanding their new designations, remain the same. Boniface the Third was not transubstantiated into another man, when, according to Baronius, he assumed the new appellation of Universal Bishop; the modern Popes, on their elevation to the papal chair, change their names; but, as all confess, retain their identity. Catholicism, according to the primitive designation, began in this manner to be denominated Protestantism, for the purpose of distinguishing the simplicity of Christianity from the superstition of Romanism.

But the name, in itself, is unimportant. The sign is nothing compared with the signification. The antiquity of the Protestant faith is easily shown. The theology of the reformed Church is found in the Bible, in the fathers, in the primitive creeds, and in the early councils. Protestantism is contained in the Word of God. The Sacred Volume is the great repository of the reformed faith. The religion, therefore, which is written with sun-beams in the New Testament, the earliest monument of Christianity, the great treasury of revealed truth, cannot, with any propriety, be denominated a novelty.*

* See Variations of Popery. By Samuel Edgar. This Work will receive a separate article in a future number; it richly deserves to be read by every Protestant.

You assert that the Church in communion with the see of Rome is the true Church, or rather the mother of all Churches. No claim is more destitute of support than this. Those who are but even slightly acquainted with the records of Christianity know that the Church of Jerusalem and others which sprung from her, as the Churches of Judæa, Galilee, Samaria, Syria, and Cilicia, and others planted by the labours of the Apostles, had an existence prior to that at Rome. If any Church could lay claim to the honour of being the mother of all others, it would belong to the Church at Jerusalem, which the Apostle St. Paul says, “is the mother of us all.” If, then, as Fletcher in his Lectures on Popery says, any particular Church had been warranted in applying to itself the promises which are applicable only to the Christian Church in general, as consisting of the whole body of the faithful, it would have been the Church at Jerusalem; and the advocates of such exclusive claims might have urged that Jerusalem was the scene of our Lord’s death and resurrection—that at Jerusalem the Apostolic ministry was first exercised—that Jerusalem was expressly termed a *Mother Church*, and that the Church at Antioch appealed to the Apostles at Jerusalem, on a question of peculiar importance to the interests of primitive Christianity. Had a fact like this been related of the Church of Rome, how would its defenders have exulted, claiming it as an incontrovertible demonstration in their favour.

Equally destitute of foundation is the claim put forth by the Church of Rome to be “the *mistress* of all Churches.” No one Church has the right to claim supremacy over other independent branches of the Church of Christ. In the primitive ages of Christianity no such claim was urged or acknowledged. Dupin, the historian of the Romish Church, a doctor of the Sorbonne, says, “It is true, that at present the name of the Church of Rome is given to the Catholic Church, and that these two terms pass for synonymous. But in antiquity, no more was intended by the name of the Church of Rome *than the Church of the city of Rome*. The Greek schismatics seem to be the first who gave the name of the Church of Rome to all Churches of the west, whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the Churches which communicated with the Church of Rome from the Greeks, who were separated from her communion. *But the other Churches did not for this lose their name, their separate individuality, or their authority.*” This testimony of Dupin is confirmed by the words of Pope Innocent III. “The Church,” he says, “is indeed called *universal*, which consists of all Churches, every where, which, by a Greek word, is denomi-

nated *Catholic* ; thus the *Roman Church is not the Universal Church*, but a part of the *Universal Church*." Tertullian recommended to the Christians of his day, as a mean of securing them in sound doctrine, to consult the Apostolic Churches, mentioning the Churches at Philippi, Corinth, Thessalonica, and Ephesus, as well as of Rome.* The Council of Chalcedon, in the fifth century, decreed that *equal respect should* be paid to the Bishops of Constantinople and Rome. These facts, with others which might be adduced, sufficiently prove that the claim of the Church of Rome to supremacy over all Churches, or to be exclusively *the* Church of Christ, was unknown and unacknowledged for at least the first five centuries. The subsequent assumption and recognition of this claim was the consequence of the corruptions of Christianity, which paved the way for the successful ambition of the Roman Pontiffs, who annihilated the rights of all other Churches.

Now what I have stated to you ought to prove that the claim which the Church of Rome urges to *supremacy*, on the ground of *antiquity*, is untenable, inasmuch as some Churches existed before her, and others were of contemporary date, and independent of her authority. This equally proves that her claim to be *the Catholic* or Universal Church, has no foundation in truth.† You may *take* to yourselves the name of *Catholic*, but you have no right to such a distinction; that title is only applicable to the Universal Church, and indeed, without the slightest reserve, to the CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—Then you assert that the Church of England is the Universal Church?

Clergyman.—I fearlessly affirm her to be a pure and apostolical branch or part of the Universal Church; for, as doctrines must be the test of pure apostolicity, or, on the contrary, proofs, that a Church has no claim to it, the doctrines of the Church of England, compared with the doctrines propounded in the New Testament, establish the right of our Church to this distinguished character beyond all power of refutation. The Church of England, unlike the Church of Rome, recognises all Churches, wherever found, which hold the truth in its purity, as so many members of that one visible and universal Church, of which Christ is the supreme Head. Thus, in the Apostle's Creed, she

* Tert. de Præscrip, Hæc. § xiv. p. 108, 109.

† See The Church of England a Faithful Witness against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, by the Rev. R. Meek, M.A. —a work that should be in the possession of every Protestant.

declares, "I believe in the *holy Catholic Church*." Thus also she prays, "for the *whole state* of Christ's militant Church here on earth;" that it would please God to inspire continually *the Universal Church* with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord, and to grant that all they that do confess his holy name may agree in the truth of his holy word, and live in unity and godly love." Wherever she discovers a true branch of the Church of Christ, she says in the true apostolic spirit, "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth, both *theirs* and *ours*." The truth of these remarks will appear more fully from a few extracts from the Homilies, and the writings of some of her most distinguished divines.

The Homily for Whitsunday declares:—"The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks whereby it is known; pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments administered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith. Now, if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd, you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more—for neither are they built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them; but so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise; which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God's word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the Bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church of Christ, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same."*

The Apology of Bishop Jewell which received the sanction of convocation, and which was published by authority, as the declaration of the Church of England, says, "We believe that there is *one* Church of God, and that the same is not shut up

* Hom. xxviii. 2.

(as in times past among the Jews) into some one corner or kingdom, but that it is Catholic and Universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world, so that there is now no nation which may truly complain that they be shut forth, and may not be one of the Church and people of God, and that this Church is the kingdom, the body, the spouse of Christ; that Christ alone is the Prince of this kingdom; that Christ alone is the Head of this body; that Christ alone is the Bridegroom of this spouse."

Bishop Bull says, "By the Catholic Church, I mean the Church *Universal*, being a collection of all the Churches throughout the world, who retain the faith *ἀπαξ* *once delivered to the saints*, that is, who hold and profess, in the substance of it, that faith and religion which was delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the first original Churches—which faith and religion is contained in the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, and the fundamentals of it are comprised in the canon or rule of faith, universally received throughout the primitive Churches, and the profession thereof acknowledged to be a sufficient *tessara*, or badge, of a Catholic Christian. *All the Churches of this day which hold and profess this faith and religion, however distant in place, or distinguished by different rites and ceremonies, yea, or divided, yet agreeing in the essentials of Christian religion, make up together one Christian Catholic Church under the Lord the supreme Head thereof.*"*

Rom. Cat. Priest.—Your arguments certainly have the appearance of strength, but proceed.

Clergyman.—As a further proof of the Anglican Church having originally been independent of the see of Rome, I must beg you to observe, that for the space of eleven hundred years after Christ, the derivation of the orders of the British Clergy from Rome was unknown; on the contrary, the Primates and Archbishops of the Anglican Church were nominated and ordained by their own suffragans at home. "Always" says Giraldus Cambrensis, "until the full conquest of Wales by Henry I. the Bishops of Wales were consecrated by the Archbishop of St. David's, and he likewise was consecrated by other Bishops, and his suffragans, without professing any manner of subjection to any other Church." When Augustine the monk visited this country for the conversion of the Saxons to the faith of Rome, he found in the principality a British Church which refused to acknowledge subjection to that of Rome, and which differed from that Church in the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. This point of disagreement is incompatible with the

* Bishop Bull on the Corruptions of the Church of Rome.

alleged derivation from, or subjection of the British Church to that of Rome. The remarks of the learned Bishop Bull are too important for us to pass over upon this point. "Our Church of Britain," says he, "was never under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, for the first six hundred years, Britain being a distinct diocese of the empire, and consequently having a Primate of her own, independent of any other Primate or Metropolitan. This appears, first, from the customs of our Church during that time, in the observation of Easter, and the administration of baptism, different from the Roman custom, but agreeing with that of the Asiatic Churches; for it is altogether incredible, that the whole British Church should so unanimously have dissented from Rome for so many hundred years together, if she had been subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop, or that the Roman Bishop all that time should have suffered it, if he had possessed a patriarchal power over it."

When Augustine demanded the submission of the British Church to the Romish Church, it was peremptorily refused. Dinothus, the learned Abbot of Bangor, in the name of the British Church, replied, "That they knew no obedience due to him whom they called the Pope but the obedience of love, and that under God they were governed by the Bishop of Caerleon." The Church of this nation then first appeared in her Protestant character in opposition to the usurped supremacy of the Church of Rome.

It is important here to observe, that the faith of Rome, as introduced by Augustine among the Saxon inhabitants of Britain, was free from many of those errors and corruptions which formed a large part of the religion of Popery in subsequent ages. Blackstone truly remarks, that "Austin introduced some *few* of Rome's corruptions"—the worst of them was the adoption of the pagan rites of the Saxons. The leading errors of the Church of Rome were not then invented or professed; some of them were at best but in an incipient state, and were not imposed as articles of faith. Among the distinguishing tenets of Popery then unknown, may be mentioned transubstantiation, communion in one kind, the supremacy of the Pope over all Bishops, purgatory, masses for the dead, the celibacy of the Clergy.

What has been said in proof, that the British Church was originally independent of Rome, is also true of the Irish Church. It appears, both in reference to this country and to Ireland, that Popery, instead of being the ancient religion, was not embraced before the middle of the twelfth century. With respect to Ireland, a learned Bishop of Salisbury adduces the Bull of Pope Adrian IV. as an incontestable proof of this. "The Bull of

Adrian IV.," the Prelate observes, "in which he gives his consent to Henry the Second's conquest of Ireland, on condition of his paying *Peter's pence*, is a curious and important historical document, and contains indisputable evidence that Popery was not the ancient religion of Ireland before the middle of the twelfth century. If this fact, *the modern introduction of Popery into Ireland*, were more generally known in that country, it might tend not a little to break that spell which blinds the eyes of the Irish papists to the errors of the Church of Rome." Leland, in his History of Ireland, affirms, that "all ecclesiastical authority in Ireland had, till about four years before the accession of Henry II., been exercised by her own Prelates." Archbishop Ussher says—"As far as I can collect from such records of the former ages as have come into my hands (either in manuscript or printed), the religion professed by the ancient Bishops, Priests, Monks, and other Christians in this land, was, for substance, the very same with that which now, by public authority, is maintained against the *foreign doctrine* brought in thither in latter times by the Bishop of Rome's followers."

Hence you must perceive that Popery was not the ancient religion of this country, as you have alleged; but, in truth, a novelty and an innovation; and also, that the Church of Rome is so far from being the "mother and mistress" of the English Church, that the latter, in fact, existed more than eleven centuries as an independent Church, refusing to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope and Church of Rome. It was not till the twelfth century that the Pope's jurisdiction was established in this country; that it was so, is to be attributed to the awful ignorance of the times, to the machinations of the Romish priesthood, and to the superstition and weakness of the British sovereigns in those days, who, in bowing their necks to Rome, imposed on their subjects a yoke, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear.

The history of our country, from that period up to the time of the Reformation, exhibits many and frequent instances of opposition to the jurisdiction usurped by the Church of Rome over the British Church and nation. The learned Prelate before quoted, says, "The Church of England is the same National Church that has subsisted from the time of its first apostolical institution, having the same episcopal government and the same fundamental doctrines which it had from the beginning, but freed from the unscriptural usages and antichristian doctrines which had crept into it during the dark ages of papal influence."*

* See Rev. R. Meek's work entitled the Church of England a Faithful Witness against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome.

But my refutation of the charge of *schism*, which you have alleged against the Protestant Church, is very far from being complete.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—*Far from complete!*

Clergyman.—Yes, I repeat it, far from complete; yet though I could fill a hundred volumes, were I to adduce the whole evidence, I have only brought forth my strength and power as the case required it. I have fed you as yet with milk, and not with meat; for you are not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—Oh! you look for a convert in me; I see the drift, though, as yet, I do not feel the force of your argument!

Clergyman.—I do not only seek for a convert in you, but in many; and before I allow you to make any observations, I must advance in my argument,

I thought that I had convicted your Church already of novelty, heresy, and schism.

Nevertheless it has been asked by a crafty member of your Church, where our religion was before Luther? As well might that individual have asked where a man's dirty face was before it was washed, as if dirt constituted any part of the human countenance—or where were the rich traces of some fine architectural building ere the accumulated dust of several generations, or the plaster of some ignorant white-washer, had been removed—or where was some ancient coin ere the canker and the corroding had been abstracted from it by the careful hand of the antiquary.* Popery thus may be compared to a field of wheat overrun with weeds: the weeds, in this case, are only obnoxious intruders which injure the useful grain. The wheat may remain and advance to maturity with accelerated vegetation, when the weeds which impede its growth are eradicated. The superstition of Romanism, in

* The ancient Greeks were accustomed to hold curious debates respecting the ship *Argos*. This ship, in which Jason sailed for the recovery of the golden fleece, was preserved, after the voyage, as a sacred relic. After the lapse of years, certain parts of the vessel gradually decayed; but so great was their veneration for their ancient relic, that they always repaired it by supplying the parts which were lost. At length the substance of the old vessel was altogether gone, and nothing remained but the additions which had been made as the old portions had perished. The question with the Greeks, therefore, was:—Whether the ship, in its patched state, was the same in which Jason actually sailed, or whether it was another? So the Church of Rome gradually lost the ancient truths of the Gospel, and supplied their places with modern errors; yet they have the hardihood to assert that the present Church of Rome is the Church which the Saviour founded, and which Paul and others watered.—*Lathbury*.

the same manner, like an exotic and running weed, deformed the Gospel, and counteracted its utility. The Reformers, therefore, zealous for the honour of religion and truth, and actuated with the love of God and man, proceeded, with skill and resolution, to separate Popish inventions from divine revelation, and exhibited the latter to the admiring world, in all its striking attraction and symmetry.

But nothing, perhaps, presents a more striking image of Popery than a person labouring under a dreadful disorder, while the same person, restored to vigorous health, will afford a lively emblem of Protestantism: for however the person may have been afflicted while in sickness, the identity is the same, and can be proved when he is in health. So with respect to Christianity, the errors of Rome never changed its original nature, however they may have corrupted it. Its nature is the same, its identity is recognized: *Protestantism* is its name; and Protestantism is derived from the BIBLE. On this foundation I will take my stand, and be ready to prove that our doctrines are derived from that Holy Volume. "The BIBLE, the BIBLE alone," says Chillingworth, "is the religion of Protestants." That book contains the whole revealed will of God, and to resort to any other rule of faith, is to reject its authority, is derogatory to the honour of Jehovah, and fatal to the soul. I tell that ingenious Roman Catholic, that our religion was in this Bible before the days of Luther; it was just where it now is, and where it ever will be found as long as the Church continues in her militant state; and, moreover, our doctrines are supported by the concurrent voice of *antiquity*. As late as the middle of the sixth century, the whole Church professed the very same faith with ourselves; they had the same canon of Scripture, and the same creeds, namely, the Apostles' and the Nicene; and even at the close of the succeeding century, though many errors had crept in and subverted the faith of numbers, the truth was still preserved, and boldly avowed not only by individuals, but by general councils. At the councils held at the following times and places—Seville, in 619; Toledo, 633; again at Toledo, 675; and Rome, 680, it was determined that no innovations should be permitted; and the sixth Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, in 681, and the fourteenth of Toledo, in 684, declare, in most explicit terms, that no innovations should be made in the Apostles' Creed, and that the Nicene Creed was perfect. During these periods, the Church maintained the ancient faith, though errors had sprung up and caused divisions; and that faith was the very same which is still possessed by the Church of England. Hence it is clear that our faith is the same as

that which was maintained by the Church a thousand years before the time of Luther. The seed was sown by the Apostles; it flourished during several ages; the tares at length sprung up and continued to increase until the period of the Reformation, when they were weeded out.

Vain indeed is your boast of antiquity. Many of your errors, I grant, are some hundred years old; but the doctrines of our Church are more than eighteen hundred years old. Ours is the old religion; it was founded by Christ and his Apostles, and has been preserved amidst afflictions, trials, and persecutions. It contracted some rust in coming down to us, especially after the sixth century; but our glorious Reformation removed the rust and preserved the metal. Our faith is the same as that of the primitive Christians and the martyrs—the same that was defended by general councils. Sometimes indeed our Church passed under a cloud, and experienced reverses; her members, during several ages prior to the Reformation, were few in number; but still our Church, the Church of Christ, was preserved. Our Reformers merely cleansed the diamond that had been covered with filth by the Church of Rome, and restored it to its former beauty and lustre. You call our Church a new Church; but just as well might it be alleged, that the Saviour erected a new temple when he cleansed the old one by driving out the buyers and sellers from its precincts; or that Hezekiah instituted a new passover when he restored that already appointed; or that the good king Josiah wrote a new law, when the book of the old law was found, after it had been neglected and forgotten by the Jewish nation.*

You regard *Tradition* as possessing authority, and so it does when it is not at variance with the Word of God. But the Fathers, be it remembered, were *men* who were not inspired, and therefore, like all other men, were likely to err. But your own witnesses shall convict you. Let us take, for instance, your prohibition of the Bible, on the ground that it is unintelligible to the people, and see how far that is agreeable to the opinions of the early Christian writers. “The Scriptures,” says St. Chrysostom, “are plain and true, and it is an easy matter to judge by them. If a man agrees with the Scriptures, he is a Christian; if not, he is out of that roll.” * * * What! have ye not a *mind* and judgment? Let us submit to the divine law, and do what is pleasing to it, and that will bring us to heaven.

* See the State of Popery and Jesuitism in England from the Reformation to the period of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. By the Rev. Thomas Lathbury.

If we study the Scriptures, we shall understand both true doctrine and a good life. St. Ambrose observes, "Let the Scriptures, let the apostles, let the prophets, let Christ be interrogated." St. Jerome says, "Let whatever is pretended to be delivered by the apostles, and cannot be proved by the testimony of the written Word, be struck with the sword of God." And again, St. Chrysostom—"Wherefore ought all Christians at this time to have recourse to the Scriptures? Because at this time heresy has infected the Churches. The divine Scriptures alone can afford a proof of genuine Christianity, and a refuge to those who are desirous of arriving at the truth of faith! I could wish that all of you would neglect what this or that man asserts for truth, and that you would investigate all those things in the Scriptures." Gregory asserts, that "*all* things which edify and instruct are contained in the Volume of Scriptures." St. Athanasius—"It (the Scripture) is plain enough to those who search for truth." Basil—"The best way to find out truth is to be much in the study of the Scriptures; the Spirit of God leads thereby to all things useful." St. Augustine—"This controversy requires a judge; let Christ judge, let us hear him speak. Let the Apostle judge with him, for Christ speaks in his Apostles."

But as we are upon this point, hear the Fathers upon the supremacy of the Pope:

"The Apostles," says St. Cyprian, "*were all of equal power and authority*, and all the rest were what St. Peter was; it was said to all alike, Feed; to all, Go ye into all the world; to all, Teach ye the Gospel." "All Bishops," says Jerome, "where-soever they are settled, whether it be at Rome or Euerbium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, they are of equal worth, and of the same priesthood." St. Gregory says, "It is the pride of Lucifer and the forerunner of Antichrist, for one Bishop to set himself above the rest; that if there were a head of the Church (on earth,) the Church must err with him."*

But I might convict you through all your errors by the mouth of your own witnesses: the testimony of my truth is the Bible, unto which "ye shall not add," for the Scriptures contain "all saving truth." The inspired prophet says, "The law of the Lord is perfect;" and St. Paul tells Timothy, the Scriptures "*are able* to make thee wise unto salvation." The same Scriptures disapprove of those who teach "for doctrines the

* See a very useful Tract published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, entitled *Dialogues between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic*. By the Rev. S. Hobson, M.A.

commandments of men," and who render "the commandments of God of none effect," by their Tradition

Thus far our remarks are sufficient to prove that antiquity is with us; that our Church is older than the age of Luther. Our doctrines are taught in the Bible by the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the first six centuries, and by a noble army of martyrs and confessors, and by others in every succeeding century down to the period of the Reformation.

There was a Church in ancient Britain long before the papacy had its origin—a Church planted, if not by the Apostles, at all events by some one or more of the apostolical Fathers; and this ancient British Church was never willingly subjugated to the Roman see. The authority claimed by the Pope in England was an usurpation; it was introduced originally by fraud. The Pope, taking advantage of the civil commotions of the country, obtained a footing in England by the permission of its monarchs, who, for various reasons, were unable or unwilling to resist the encroachments of the Papal see. By the ancient British Church the Bishop of Rome was viewed merely as any other Prelate; and under the sway of Gregory the Great, in 590, he did not know, on hearing of the Britons, whether they were Christians or Pagans, so far were they from owning, or he from claiming, their subjection to the Papacy; and it is certain that none of the Popish tenets were received in the British Church. But I cannot forbear alluding, as we are now upon this question, to your boasted but fallacious argument relative to the *unity* of your Church. You deny that we are of the true Church because we are not at *unity* with ourselves. Now was it not predicted by our Saviour, that there would be "divisions among us?" Those predictions have been fulfilled; but it does not follow that the stability of the Anglican Church is injured, because unity is no characteristic of the true Church. The Temple at Jerusalem was the true Church before Christ, and yet the money-changers and those who sold doves defiled its sacred walls; so have sectaries and Romanists defiled the true Church of Christ. But the majority of schismatics derive their faith from the very same stream, and only differ about the interpretation of that faith. The points of difference are not fundamental. But I will destroy the foundation of your Church by your own argument. You believe that *unity* is the characteristic of the true Church. Now I unhesitatingly affirm that there is no Church or Sect more at variance among themselves than the Church of Rome. The history of that Church is full of *divisions*. At one time there were *three* Popes, each claiming supremacy, opposing each other, and destroying all *unity*. The canons of councils, and the decrees of Popes are diametrically opposed. Many of the doc.

trines of the Romish Church are contradictory, and by no means to be depended upon. The *unity* of the Romish Church rests on historical fact. It has been a Church long divided against itself, without stability, foundation, or authority. And if you urge, that because there are divisions among us, our Church is not the true Church, the very same argument will destroy the validity of your own. If the foundation of both Churches are thus demolished, where then is the true Church to be found? Your argument on this head is puerile; nevertheless, should you continue to press that part of the evidence, I shall be prepared to overturn it by a mass of historical and approved facts, which perhaps will startle the whole fraternity.

But I shall now proceed to support the charge of novelty and heresy against your Church. You ask us where our Church was before Luther? Now I ask you, where your Church was before the council of Trent? Where was your Church during the space of 600 years after our Lord? You talk of antiquity, but old as your errors may be, they are much more recent in their origin than the sixth century. I challenge you to trace the succession of your doctrines through those centuries. Your creed is *new* in all its parts, *in which it differs from us*, and which are the points that constitute what is termed Popery. For 600 years none of your errors were received. Your papal indulgences were yet unhatched, your purgatory fire was yet unkindled; it made not, as afterwards, your pot boil and your kitchen smoke; the mass was yet unmoulded; transubstantiation was yet unbaked; the treasury of merits was yet unmerited; the Pope's transcendent power was uncreated; ecclesiastics were unexempted; and deposing of kings yet undreamt of; the lay people were not yet cozened of the cup; communion under one kind was not yet in kind; it was not then known that liturgies and prayers were made in a tongue unknown.* But here are the dates which have lately been given in a popular Journal of the errors of your Church.†

	Years		Years
Holy Water	120	Image Worship	715
Penance	150	Canonization of Saints.....	993
Monkery	328	Baptism of Bells	1000
Latin Mass	394	Transubstantiation	1000
Extreme Unction	558	Celibacy	1015
Purgatory	593	Indulgences	1190
Invocation of the Virgin		Dispensations	1200
Mary and of Saints	594	The Inquisition	1204
Papal Usurpation.....	607	Confession	1215
Kissing the Pope's toe	709	Elevation of the Host ...	1222

See Birkbeck's Protestant's Evidence. † United Service Gazette.

Now these dates prove the novelty of your Church in comparison with the Anglican. And if you urge that the above dates are incorrect, I answer that they are not so incorrect as to destroy the evidence of the novelty of your Church.

But before we part, you must allow me to refer you to several passages of the Bible which contradict many of the errors in your Church, and I will do so for the benefit of my Protestant brethren, rather than upon this particular occasion to convince you, because I fear that your creed teaches you a prejudice against being guided solely by the Scriptures; but my argument would be incomplete were I to omit this part of the evidence. And for this reference I am indebted to that indefatigable and noble Protestant, the Rev. T. Lathbury, as I have been upon former occasions, and whose works you should study with a teachable and unprejudiced disposition:

First, now your neglect of the Bible is contrary to John v. 39; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, and many other passages.

The invocation of saints is contrary to Matt. xi. 27, 28; John vi. 37. xiv. 13, xvi. 23, 24; Acts iv. 12, x. 25, 26, xiv. 13, 14, 15; Romans viii. 27; Ephes. iii. 12; Col. ii. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 John ii. 1, 2.

Image worship is contrary to Lev. xxvi. 1; Deut. iv. 15, 16, v. 7, 8, 9; Is. xl. 18, 19, 20; Micah v. 13; Matt. iv. 10; Rev. xix. 10.

Communion in one kind is contrary to Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28.

Transubstantiation is contrary to Luke xxii. 17, 18, 19, 20; 1 Peter iii. 18; Heb. ix. 25, 26; 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Purgatory is contrary to Gal. iii. 13; Heb. i. 13. ix. 14, x. 10; Rom. v. 1, 2, 10, 11; Rev. xiv. 13.

Indulgences are contrary to Heb. x. 10 to 21, ix. 24 to 21, vii. 25.

Prayers in an unknown tongue are contrary to 1 Cor. xiv.

Auricular confession to a priest is contrary to Is. iv. 7; Acts ii. 51. iii. 19, xvi. 30, 31; 1 Rom. x. 9.

To enable my Protestant brethren still more fully to convict you of maintaining doctrines which are subversive of the faith of the Gospel, the following contrast of the peculiarities of Popery with the declarations of Sacred Scripture is submitted to notice.

You assert that the Virgin Mary was free from original sin: but the Scriptures declare that all are sinners, without any exception whatever. See Rom. v.

You assert that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament: the Scriptures declare that his body is similar to ours, sin alone excepted. According to the Scripture declaration,

therefore, the body of Jesus cannot be present in the sacrament, or it cannot be like ours.

The Scriptures declare that Christ alone is our Redeemer; but you teach that the priest can redeem souls from purgatory.

The Bible asserts again and again that we are justified by faith alone; but the Church of Rome declares that man is formally justified by works.

We believe that Jesus Christ was wounded for our transgressions, and that by his stripes we are healed; but you perform certain penances, from which you expect pardon.

We believe, on the authority of the Bible, that the sins of man are purged away by the blood of Christ; you teach that they are purged away in the fire of purgatory, and by your own satisfaction.

We, on the authority of the Bible, believe that all sins deserve eternal death. See Gal. iii. 10; Rom. vi. 23; you teach that some sins are venial and others mortal, and that the former may be done away by holy water and certain ceremonies.

We rely on one sacrifice once offered, the Lord Jesus Christ; you assert that a sacrifice is daily offered in the mass. Thus, according to the Church of Rome, the Saviour is sacrificed daily by a priest. A new saviour made of bread is offered up. It is the worship of a new mediator to whom you erect altars.

We pray to God alone through Christ; you pray to the Virgin and to saints; nay, you even make God an intercessor to the saints, for you pray to him that you may obtain your desires through the intercession of the saints.

We believe that oaths and promises are sacred things, and binding on the conscience; but the Church of Rome teaches that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and that solemn engagements may be broken for the good of the Church.

By comparing your doctrines with sacred writ, it will be seen that the Popish dogmas and the Bible are opposite to each other. The most unlearned Protestant may adopt this method; nor will the most learned Papist be able to confute him. The process is a simple one, and must be successful. It is a truth which cannot be disputed, that no one becomes a Papist till he despises the Bible, and believes the word of the priest rather than the Word of God.

Thus have I established the antiquity of the Church of England, and the *novelty* and *heresy* of the Church of Rome; and I defy and challenge you to dispute the facts, or to shew the fallacy of the arguments.

Rom. Cat. Priest.—It will take me a very long time to attempt to do either, so that with your permission we will adjourn to some future day.

Clergyman.—Granted; go then and consult with your brother priests, and do not advance anything but what has received their sanction. I by no means wish to hurry you, the subject is too important for a hasty conclusion; I will give you *two months* or more, if you please, for your defence. Till then, PEACE BE WITH YOU.

SUBJECT.

ART. VIII.—1. *Tracts for the Times.** By Members of the University of Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

OPPONENTS.

2. *The Authority of Tradition in Matters of Religion.* By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDER, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1838.
3. *Not Tradition, but Revelation.* By PHILLIP N. SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. London: Rivingtons. 1838.
4. *The Popery of Oxford confronted, disavowed, and repudiated.* By PETER MAURICE, M.A. (late of Jesus College) Chaplain of New and All Souls' Colleges, and Officiating Minister of Kennington, Berks. London: Baisler. 1837.
5. *Modern High Church Principles examined.* London: Seeleys. 1837.
6. *A Brief Examination of Professor Keble's Visitation Sermon, entitled "Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture," and preached in the Cathedral of Winchester.* By WM. WILSON, D.D., Prebendary of Winchester. Oxford: Parker; London: Rivingtons. 1837.
7. *Letters on the Writings of the Fathers of the two first Centuries.* By MISOPAPISTICUS. London: Seeleys. 1838.

PARTISANS.

8. *Remains of the late Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* In 2 vols. London: Rivingtons. 1838.
9. *A Sermon preached at the primary Visitation of Charles Thomas Lord Bishop of Ripon.* By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

WE are now about to enter upon one of the most momentous inquiries by which the Church of Christ has been agitated for many years; one, in which we are called upon to determine,

* The Author of a publication, entitled *Travels in Town*, in his

whether the zeal be according to knowledge or contrary to it. The question is one in which we must weigh without bias the λόγος and the διδασκαλία; one, in which we must decide, whether the authors of the *Tracts for the Times* have a tendency to Popery, or whether they can be accounted orthodox. We are aware that we are not discussing the merits of ordinary men; nevertheless, we shall make our remarks freely, but without seeking unduly to give offence.

The Tracts seem at first to have obtained respect and circulation, from their enforcement of Apostolical Succession in our Church; nor was it suspected that any purpose of innovation and of raising Tradition to the standard of God's Word was contemplated. For some time afterwards, they appeared more injudicious than dangerous: but now no one can avoid perceiving that they are making new and serious breaches in the Christian world, and dividing our house against itself. The authority of the Fathers, which is claimed for their assertions, will only be admitted according to the opinions which each may have formed of it: the varying sentiments and contradictions of the Fathers will prevent general deference from being paid to it. All, therefore, that the writers will effect, will be the rise of a new party in the Church, which, if we may judge from its present deportment, will ultimately lapse into *Romanism*.

As Mr. Holden has very clearly shewn that a great proportion of what is pressed on our attention depends upon Tradition: the question is, can "the traditionary creed of the Church, so far as it is known to us, be *proved* to be identically the same as that which was preached by Christ and the Apostles?" If this proof can be given, it should be received, as the test of Orthodoxy; if it cannot, it should be only respected as human testimony: and it will need but little reflection to decide, that the required proof is impossible; that the ecclesiastical Traditions, on which so great a stress is now laid, can never be authenticated, as purely and trans-

allusion to the Editor of this periodical, says: "The charge of Puseyism lies against him, inasmuch as he has so lavishly praised the men, and recommended their works, who were the first to broach, and still continue the leading champions of those sentiments;" and in another place calls this Review *the organ of the Puseyites!* The Editor wishes distinctly to disclaim any connection with the party alluded to: if he has praised any of their works, it has only been when they have contained sound Church principles; but when the authors have departed from *them*, he has, in the same independent spirit by which this *Quarterly* has always been conducted, reprobated and exposed the tendency of their peculiar opinions, as the present Article will testify.

missively conveying the declarations of our Saviour and his Apostles, that even an uniformity with the Scriptures in certain parts will not amount to a demonstration, that they proceeded from the same source as the Scriptures, and that no one thing to be discovered in the early ecclesiastical writings can fix on them the character of divine. Mr. Holden very properly urges, that corruptions existed in the primitive age of the Church, and thus that there will be the same difficulty in distinguishing the true Church in the primitive as in subsequent ages. Of these corruptions, the epistolary parts of the New Testament give an overwhelming evidence; in the age too succeeding the Apostles, schisms and heretical opinions abounded, and most of the Churches were lacerated with intestine divisions. But though the Church was at no time free from the pernicious doctrines of heretics, "the essentials of the faith, which was at first delivered by the Holy Ghost and sent down from heaven, are still taught:" and the errors of particular Churches have never destroyed the substance of sound doctrine.

It is, however, asserted in the Tracts (No. 71), that the heretics were always distinguished from the Catholic body; that the sects in every country bore their own refutation on their forehead, in that they were of recent origin; that all those societies in every country which the Apostles had founded, did agree together in one; and that no time short of the Apostles could be assigned with any show of argument for the rise of their existing doctrine. Mr. Holden rejoins, that *this assertion* bears its own refutation *on its forehead*; that since heresy is proved by the Scriptures to have existed in the lifetime of the Apostles, it cannot be called of recent origin; that there is no evidence, that all the societies founded by the apostles agreed in one; and that to allege "that the faith of the orthodox had its rise at no time short of the Apostles, is a mere assumption, which, if proved, would not of itself prove also, that it was the creed delivered by the inspired teachers of Christianity." Further, the simple fact of this or that doctrine having been received by several early Churches, does not absolutely prove apostolicity; for the inerrancy of these Churches must be first established; and as a corruption of religion soon began, and as we know not that these Churches may not have erred, no article of faith, solely because they received it, can therefore be pronounced apostolical. But the coincidence of many ancient Churches in religious opinions is said, on the other hand, to amount to more than a presumption, that these transmissive doctrines had a divine origin; yet what avails the presumption, when the evidence, which is required to verify these writers, is

wanting? It will also be required for this, that the coincidence should be universal; and not merely universal, but that proofs of apostolical origin should be produced. With respect, likewise, to the inference that the transmissive belief of the primitive Christians must have been in exact unison with the doctrines promulgated by the Apostles, it is one which will not bear an examination. When we consider the eagerness of the spirit of heathenism in the early ages to intrude into the sanctuary the false philosophy which often successfully corrupted the doctrines of the gospel—the darkness of pagan idolatry, in which the human mind had been long involved—the difficulty with which the early Christian converts comprehended a pure and spiritual religion—the deficiency of the primitive teachers in cautious inquiry, in close reasoning and hermeneutical skill, (as Mr. Holden continues), it is no wonder that they were sometimes led away by the errors of the times, which became difficult of detection, on account of the paucity of written documents:—and it is plain, that the primitive Christians could not have derived from their proximity to the apostolic age all the advantages which are supposed. The oral instruction of the Apostles, as these writers understand it, would have been yet more liable to be mistaken, more liable to misconception on the part of the hearers: the preaching of their cotemporaries would have been equally liable to misapprehension, and the probability of error must have increased at every remove: no steady light of divine truth could have been therefore thus communicated: no oral instructions could have descended to the second generation without some mixture of error. If idolatry found an entrance into the households of Nahor and Terah, (Gen. xxxi. 30-53); of Isaac, Esau, and Jacob, (Gen. xxxi. 22.-xxxv. 2); if the true religion had become corrupted during the servitude in Egypt, (Josh. xxiv. 14), parallel examples of the truth of these remarks are before us; and it is absurd to argue, that what took place in these instances could not have taken place with the early Christians. Oral Tradition is always unsafe: it has always been that to which the advocates of a corrupt faith have applied as to a paramount authority: it was that by which the Jews, in our Saviour's time, rendered the word of God of no effect: it is that which the Papist still claims as the sanction of his doctrines. If Oral Tradition had been designed to direct the Church, we cannot conceive why the New Testament should have been written—why the Apostles should have committed to writing the substance of the doctrines which they preached. On the same principle as they *wrote*, Moses was desired to *write* the law, as a protection against the insecurity of Oral Tradition!

As to the rule of Vincent of Lirins, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*, &c. which is urged in support of the unbroken continuity of traditive belief from the very period of its origin, Mr. Holden observes, that it is not within the reach of human ability to discover what were the precise tenets held *every where, always, and by all*; that Omniscience alone could accomplish so mighty a task; consequently, that some abatements must be made from the universality of the rule. And if it must necessarily be coerced by limits, its capability of constituting a proof of apostolicity may be doubted: and when it pre-supposes unanimity, absolute antiquity, and universality, it begs the question, and assumes what it should prove. But this acute writer objects, that as it was out of the power of any one or of all the writers in the three first centuries, whose works are extant, to have ascertained the doctrine of ALL the Apostolical Churches, these declarations must be accepted with considerable limitations—that heretical opinions having sprung up, even in the infancy of the Church, grown with its growth, and increased with its strength; and a great part of the ecclesiastical writers having been occupied in refuting them, the doctrinal uniformity of the primitive ages is disproved—that as certain early heretics either rejected a large portion of the Scriptures received by the Church, or mutilated them, or acknowledged several spurious books, the Fathers could not properly argue with such on scriptural grounds, and could only appeal to the traditionary doctrine, and that thus tradition was not introduced as infallible or equipotent with the Scriptures, but merely as the only common ground of argument. Again, certain heretics contended that their doctrines were conformable to those of the Apostles; that they had been conveyed to them by tradition in perfect purity; and that in process of time they had been perverted by their opponents. This allegation the Fathers denied, retorting the charge of perversion on their antagonists—so that Tradition was equally claimed by either party.

But the Fathers occasionally called the Scriptures themselves *Tradition*; sometimes the creed or summary of necessary articles of faith handed down in the Apostolic Churches, was likewise so denominated. In the latter case, Tradition was a system of doctrine really contained in the Scriptures, and one to be proved from the Scriptures, not anything perfectly independent of them; in fact, a compendium of Scriptural doctrines. “Lastly, (proceeds this writer), the Fathers declare, with one voice, that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to be known, believed, and practised for salvation;” which are words that fully refute the extravagant assertions of those who would raise Tradition to an authority equal to the Scriptures.

He then discusses the sense in which Irenæus understood Tradition, and unanswerably refutes the usual meaning applied to his words—shewing, with Stillingfleet, that where he speaks most of Tradition, he resolves the ground of faith wholly and entirely into Scripture; and that those who otherwise apprehend him take citations on trust, or only search him for the words of those citations, not taking the pains to inquire into the scope and design of his discourse. As Irenæus always asserts the paramount authority of the Scriptures—as he affirms Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, to have *reported all things agreeably to the Scriptures*, it is evident, that he believed the Scriptures to be supreme in matters of faith, not Tradition to have been another Apostolical standard of Christian doctrines.

By him and Tertullian, Tradition was accounted only an evidence subsidiary to the Scriptures : it was cited in proof, that the Scriptures were written by those to whom they are attributed—by neither was it elevated to the rank which has been assumed. The opinion of Tertullian, on this point, has been so fully proved by a living prelate to have been conformable to our twentieth Article, and opposed to the Roman Catholic notion, that this part of the subject may be safely dismissed; for it is very apparent, that in many passages cited from the Fathers in support of Tradition, they meant the doctrines *delivered down* in the sacred writings—not that to which modern appeal is so forcibly made.

Among other things wanting is the continuity of consent : also the primary and connecting link in the chain of evidence is wanting. Irenæus is the earliest subject of appeal ; but as he flourished late in the second century, and as the other authorities flourished at a much later period, there is a great chasm which cannot be supplied : “and a failure in tracing at any one period the uncontaminated descent of Tradition from the Apostles, subverts the very foundation upon which the high authority claimed for it, is built.”

The advocates of the theory which is now perplexing the Church, use language nearly similar to that of the Roman Catholics in support of Tradition, and quote texts in common with them, to justify its pretensions. If their words be admitted, how imperceptibly may Protestants glide into Popery ! Mr. Churton in particular has quoted texts which are insufficient to establish the authority of Tradition as a standard of faith. It is not disputed, that the Apostles delivered oral as well as written instructions ; but if these oral instructions were not embodied in Scripture, who *now* can tell us what they were ? Who can show that the Traditions, to which appeal is *now* made, were *the same or indeed*

had any relationship to them? One text, on which great reliance is placed, is 2 Thess. ii. 15; but were the παραδόσεις in the Apostle's preaching (λόγω) different from the παραδόσεις in the Apostle's epistles? and as the epistles were *written* documents, and as we cannot imagine men acting under the influence of the Holy Spirit to have omitted any thing necessary to salvation in those *written* documents, we cannot admit a distinction in this passage, especially, since the words, *ὡς ἐδιδάχθητε*, must convince every unbiassed mind, that these παραδόσεις were things that had been generally taught. Tradition, in the sense in which it is claimed, could not have continued pure for a century; much less could it have been conveyed uncorrupted to our times: how any men of critical minds can attach certainty to it, and write of its *pure sources*, we cannot understand. In 2 Tim. i. 14. Mr. Keble understands τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην as "the treasure of apostolical doctrines and Church rules, containing," (according to the citation by Mr. Holden), "besides the substance of Christian doctrine, a certain form, arrangement, and selection, methodizing the whole, and distinguishing fundamentals; and also a certain system of Church-practice, both in government, discipline, and worship—comprising matter independent of, and distinct from, the truths, which are directly Scriptural." It is most manifest that this is mere conjecture, and that the words contain in themselves no authority for this amplification: in fact, Suicer, (*in voce*), has given instances of a different interpretation. Whatever was the παρακαταθήκη, the text only enjoins Timothy to keep it safe: it is silent even *how* it was to be kept safe; and Mr. Keble's notion of matter *independent of and distinct from the truths, which are directly Scriptural*, in other words, *Tradition*, is unwarranted by it. Have we, however, *evidence*, that that which is now called *primitive Tradition* was the good deposit committed to Timothy? For all the texts collectively which refer to the *oral* teaching of the Apostles, do not prove it to have been distinct from that teaching which is preserved in the Scriptures. We ask, do not the partisans of Tradition virtually assert the Scriptures to be *defective*? and is not the traditionary interpretation of many passages contrary to the simplest rules of hermeneutics?

Mr. Holden states, that it is likewise urged, that the Scripture no where hints that its authority was to supersede that of the unwritten word—no where asserts that it is by itself an intelligible rule of faith: that "so far from it, the Scriptures, on the very face of them, bear testimony to the contrary." In other words, this argument asserts the insufficiency of the Scriptures. Now, as our Saviour, arguing with the Jews, did not refer to Tradition, but to the Jewish Scriptures, for proof—as the Apostles, seeking

to convince the Jews, reasoned not from Tradition, but from the Scriptures; and as, by Tradition, the Jews were said to have made the Word of God of no effect, it is very clear, that Christ and his Apostles considered the Scriptures alone as the intelligible rule of life and faith; and that if this was the case with the Old Testament, parity of reasoning exacts, that it should also have been the case with the New. We cannot understand, since the Apostles were enjoined to *write* (Apoc. i. 10, 11—ii. 1, 8, 12, &c. xiv. 12, xxi. 5, cf. 2; Pet. iii. 1, 2; St. John Ep. i—i. 3. 4. ii. 1. 12. 13. 14. 26. v. 13. 1 Cor. xi. 23.), how any thing traditionary, and, therefore, uncertain, can assume an authority with reference to that which *has been written*, unless it be one most subordinate and open to criticism. St. Luke evidently thought Tradition an *uncertain* guide; for he wrote his Gospel, that Theophilus might know the *certainty* or *security* (ἀσφαλεια) of the *oral* (καθὼς παρέδοσαν—περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης) instruction, which he had received. Had the Evangelist not foreseen the possible and probable corruption of this *oral* instruction, the cause which impelled him to *write* would not have existed. St. John, too, (xx. 31.) says, “These are *written*, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, *and that believing, ye might have life through his name*;” than which no words can more fully express the perfect *sufficiency* of the Scriptures, and, by consequence, the inadequacy of Tradition. St. Paul likewise *wrote* to Timothy, *him to whom was committed the good deposit*, that he might know *how to behave himself* in the house of God, (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15); whence it appears, that if the good deposit had been *oral instruction*, it was insufficient without this hortatory epistle. In his second Epistle iii. 16, 17, St. Paul unequivocally maintains *the complete sufficiency* of the Scriptures; and St. Peter, (1 Ep. iv. 11), desires that if any man speak, he should speak *as the oracles of God*, by which the written Word, not *Tradition*, must have been meant.*

In the cause of the Scriptures against Tradition, Dr. Shuttleworth, the Warden of New College, Oxford, steps forth also as a powerful champion. He rightly maintains *in limine*, that if the first links which ought to connect a chain with any given object be wanting, no addition to its length at the opposite end

* Compare Deut. vi. 6-8. xi. 8-21. xxx. 9-10. xxxi. 11-13. xvii. 19 1 Kings ii. 3. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 31. Ps. xii. 6. xix. 7-11. lxix. 105. Is. viii. 20. xxxiv. 16. Mal. iv. 4. Matt. xxii. 29. Mark xii. 24. Luke xvi. 29. x. 25, 26. John v. 39. Acts xvii. 11.—*particularly* Rev. xxii. 18. 19., which, *in principle*, applies to all the works of all the inspired writers.

will remedy the defect; and that to defend Tradition by appealing to Tradition is, in fact, reasoning in a circle. He adduces a striking passage from Irenæus, (adv. Hær. iii. 1.) who, be it remembered, is claimed as an authority for Tradition, which passage unequivocally declared, that what the first teachers of Christianity originally taught by word of mouth, they afterwards *committed to writing*; and that those writings *are the books of the New Testament*: consequently, the *παράδοσις* of the Apostles were the materials from which the Gospels and Acts were made, and were identical with the doctrinal parts of the Epistles. From the second Chapter of the same Book it further appears, that “the first appeal to floating Tradition, as containing articles of belief, in addition or in contradiction to the records of holy writ, was made by the earliest of those numerous classes of heretics, who, at so early a period of the Church, attempted to engraft their own inventions upon the Revelation of God’s will.” When he again says, that the sound Traditions derived directly by the Church from the Apostles themselves in all points harmonized and coincided with the written Word, we have datum in vindication of our preceding interpretation of Apostolical *παράδοσις*. We have thus a proof, that Irenæus cannot be justly cited as a Traditionist.

Dr. Shuttleworth has likewise clearly established, that neither Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Ignatius, nor the historians of the Martyrdom of the two latter, made Tradition a second standard of faith, nor set it up as an auxiliary to Revelation. Nor can we conceive, that St. Paul especially, who called the Jewish traditions *Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μύθοι καὶ ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων* (Tit. i. 14.) and cautioned Timothy against them (1 Ep. i. 4.) stigmatizing (iv. 7.) them as *γραῶδεις μύθοι*, if he had wished Tradition to direct the Christian Church, would not have left some injunctions respecting it. Nor in the writings of Justin Martyr is there any reference to oral communications, as opposed to those which the Apostles left recorded in writing for the edification of the Church—no hint of an esoteric and exoteric system of Christianity. Thus have we descended beyond the first 150 years after the close of our Lord’s ministry; during which period the doctrine of Tradition, as being concurrent in authority with the Scriptures, was not imagined. Had the case been otherwise, we should have found during this interval some allusion to it as a rule of faith, some sifting of the evidence on which it rested, some direct retracing of it to the Apostles; and Justin Martyr, who disputed with Trypho, *especially*, might have been expected to have been diffuse in its favour. The opinions of the writers of the third or fourth centuries, from the inability to support them by the

evidence of the earlier, have little value; and if we would see, how Tradition involved itself in the fabulous, as it proceeded down the stream of time, we need only consult the pages of the Byzantine authors.

Tradition should always be received with great caution: it has ever been the engine by which the commandments of men have been set in opposition to the revelations of God. It was the tool which enabled the Jews to wrest and wrench the Scriptures from their obvious interpretation: it was the tool by which many of the early heretics forced the Gospels to their purpose: why should it not be so again, if it be equalized with the *written* Word? What Tradition has performed for the Roman Catholics, it may perform for others. If God, by miraculous aid, enabled certain persons to write an infallible record of his will—an infallible directory for mankind, what they wrote must necessarily be accounted complete; if not, the anomaly of something *uncertain*, therefore *fallible*, as an indispensable aid to the *infallible*, will be presented to us. Hence Dr. Shuttleworth properly contends, that there is an *à priori* improbability against divine inspiration having been afforded to an incomplete Scripture; that if the *written* works of the Apostles are merely a kind of *πάρεργα*, mere incidental allusions to doctrines stated elsewhere, it will follow, “that as the original record has at all events not come down to our time, the revelation of God’s will which we now possess, is necessarily incomplete; that we know not at this moment the whole of our religion, what it has been, and should be.” For, (as he continues), to assert, that the oral instruction of the Apostolical ages has been transmitted to our times in anything like purity, or a state capable of identification through all the thousand heresies of eighteen hundred years, on the almost total extinction of Christian knowledge in Europe before the Reformation, is the merest gratuitous assumption, contradicted by historical testimony. Where were the *pure* Traditions of the Church in the ignorant and superstitious middle ages of Europe? In this dark epoch was true Christianity to be found any where but in the Scriptures?

We cannot escape from the dilemma—either that “revelation, supposing it to have originally consisted of the written Scriptures and of Oral Tradition, is at this moment incomplete, the communication having been lost in the lapse of ages, and the supplementary written portion alone having descended to us; or, that, on the other hand, we must be prepared to receive the canonical books of the New Testament, as an entire, full, and sufficient declaration of the will of God and summary of our faith.” That the latter is correct, we cannot doubt; for to

assert, that traditionary doctrines passing from mouth to mouth, capable of modification according to the wishes of the reporters, are *revelation*, and as such equally binding on the belief and conscience as the Holy Scriptures (as we hear in the present day), is most startling, and in our opinion opens a ready door to heresy and schism.

The proximity to the Apostolic age yields not proof, that the early Christians could not have made important mistakes : for at that time inspiration had ceased. Without inspiration, we cannot imagine unmixed truth to have been orally transmitted from one generation to another ; if we affirm, that in this transmission there was no taint or superaddition of human speculation, we must exempt those successive generations from one of the most besetting infirmities of our nature. If we compare the writings of the Apostles with those of the primitive Christian Fathers, we instantly perceive that we have passed the boundary of inspiration : we perceive the writers to be merely fallible beings : Traditions descending to us through such a channel, can, therefore, not be put in competition with the inspired documents.

In evidence, that no inspiration can be assigned even to Clemens Romanus, Dr. Shuttleworth instances his notice of the phoenix, not merely as illustrative of the resurrection, but as asserting the existence of that fabulous bird, as an established fact in natural history—how much less can it be assigned to those who lived at later periods ? In Justin Martyr we observe, occasionally, strange inferences drawn from Holy Writ, verbal inaccuracies arising from misquotations, or quotations *memoriter*, and continually perceive most inconclusive reasoning, such as his deduction of moral evil from the *progeny of angels having commerce with antediluvian females*.* Such was his interpretation of the בני אלהים. What shall we say “ of his discovering the holy symbol of the cross in the masts of shipping, in the implements of husbandry, in the tools of the carpenter, and even in the position of the nose and eyebrows in the human face ;” and of his quoting Lam. iv. 20, in support of the last idea ? Shall we accredit *Tradition*, handed down by such a person ? Moreover, if Irenæus,† by some called the Disciple of Polycarp, the Disciple of St. John, who in this case ought to have known the truth, asserted for the sake of supporting a fanciful theory, in illustration of John viii. 57., that our Lord must have nearly reached his fiftieth year at the time of his crucifixion—to make out which, contrary to the express declaration of the four Evangelists, he

* See a subsequent note.

† Adv. Hær. ii. 39.

interpolated more than fifteen years between his baptism and the commencement of his ministry—of what authority can he be in matters of Tradition? If such distinguished men as Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen bore testimony to the authenticity of that stupid production and forgery, the apocryphal epistle of Barnabas, whose misrepresentations of the Levitical law, cabbalistical nonsense, and monstrous blunders abundantly refute it, how can they be trusted respecting orally traditive communications? If Lactantius, too, could repeat the outrageous and stupid error of this unknown author on Isaiah xlv. 1., and reading Κύριος for Κῶρος, and arguing from that blunder as from a truth, could have applied the passage to Christ—in the one, *ὁ Χριστὸς Κυρίῳ μου*, in the other *Christo Domino meo*—can we, witnessing this want of Biblical knowledge, account him a safe custodier of Tradition? Nay, who that have read the frivolities with which the pages of the Fathers are filled, will trust their *judgment* respecting any standard of faith separate from the written Word? Who will allow these fanciful men to hand down to us another rule of life?

After this period, the progress of innovation was so rapidly accelerated, that before the close of the fourth century, many of the abuses which human invention had superadded to divine revelation, became almost completely established. These were subsequently matured into Popery in its worst form. When we find Augustine approving the administration of the Eucharist, for the purpose of removing a murrain from cattle, under the idea that it was caused by demons,* and recounting a miraculous vision vouchsafed for the purpose of discovering the concealed bones of Gervasius and Protasius, interred two centuries before;† when, about the same period, we read the miracles gravely related by Sulpicius Severus;‡ and consider, that through these periods, the Oral Traditions of the Church must have descended, and descended *unimpaired*, if we would accept them as sound portions of Apostolic teaching, we must be more than ordinarily credulous, if we can assent to their integrity or authenticity.

It is to Tradition, which is, as we have described it, that a party in Oxford would, in these days, direct the Church as to a rival of the Word of God! They would hew out for us a broken cistern which can hold no water; and little by little

* De Civitate Dei xxii. 8.; in which are many most marvellous legends.

† Confess. ix. 8.

‡ Dial. i. 7, 8, 9.; iii. 6.

lead us back to all the corruptions of Popery. It is impossible to foresee the mischief which they are performing, and which they are leading others to perform; yet it requires no prophetic spirit to perceive, that as Tradition before conducted the Church to Popery, the Tradition which these men advocate, will have a similar result, if it be revered, as they wish it to be. It is a fond fancy, that the adoption of Tradition may be restricted to any particular period of the Church; the barrier which the present party may prescribe to themselves will perhaps be broken down by their disciples; and all the gross absurdities of the later writers, often not exceeded by the Talmud or the Sonnah, may thus force their way gradually as points of faith. Nay, is not the mummary of abandoning the reading desk, of kneeling on the steps of the altar, and of affected and Pharisaic individuals, wearing the cross, sure indications of what will follow? Will not trine baptism, total immersion,* and unction be advocated upon the same principles? Nay, as prayers for the dead have already their apologists, as Bishop Ken has been canonized in a service formed on the Popish model, and deceased relations and friends have been provided with a devotional commemoration, and the Breviary itself has been strongly recommended to us, because our reformers did not go far enough, we may, as the fancy of these men ferments, expect a βαπτισμος υπερ των νεκρων, to be enrolled among our institutions. Their progress has been stealthy and dangerous; and if the Bishop of Oxford will tolerate such mountebankism and such doctrines in his diocese, no one can tell where these innovations on our established ecclesiastical practice will end. If the Church, according to our Articles, has the sole power of deciding on her rites, no member of that Church has a right to

* Baptism was mostly confined to Easter and Whitsuntide; and, from a Tradition, that the West was the place of darkness; the candidate's face was directed to that quarter. When he renounced the Devil and his works, he was wont to stretch out his hand, as if in defiance of him: the renunciation twice took place, once before the congregation, and once at the font. Then followed a sort of *exorcism*; after which he was stripped of his garments, and anointed with oil, the sign of the cross being made upon his forehead. Then *twice* immersion took place, afterwards another unction; and at last he was clothed in a white garment, which he wore for a week, and then deposited in the Church. If we were to revert to such falsely called primitive customs, the simplicity of our services would be destroyed, and these absurd and other equally absurd encumbrances would supply its place. These were a yoke which our fathers could not bear.

add to them, or subtract from them, under any pretext: if any one be dissatisfied with her formularies and institutions, let him leave her communion, and not try to establish a new sect within her pale.

When Mr. Froude, in his *Remains*, says, "I should like to know why you *flinch* from saying, that the *power of making the body and blood of Christ* is vested in the successors of the Apostles;" when he advises us to reject "*the obnoxious phrase Mass-book*," and substitute for it "*the Liturgy of Peter*," which not all the criticisms of the collective party can *prove* it to be; when he asks, why we praise Ridley?—when he unblushingly, on many occasions, avows his hatred to "the Reformation and the Reformers," and declares, that "the Reformation was a limb badly set: it must be broken again, in order to be righted," and talks of our trumpery principles about Scripture as the sole rule in *fundamentals*—is it possible to deny, that the writer of these offensive expressions may with good reason be suspected to have been a disguised Papist? There was a time when such things would not have been tolerated by the spiritual Authorities; when Bishops, mindful of their solemn office, would have laboured to preserve the Church in unity and wholesome discipline, and not have looked on, as now like so many Gallios, careless of these things and their consequences. There was a time when no Clergyman could have offered the Breviary as supplying matter for devotion, without losing his gown; without the fact being accepted as evidence, that he was in heart a Papist. There was a time, when no Clergyman would have written the following hymn:—

Ave Maria! Mother Bless'd,
To whom caressing and caress'd
 Clings the eternal child;
Favor'd beyond archangel's dream,
When first on thee, with tend'rest gleam
 Thy new-born Saviour smil'd.
Ave Maria! Thou, whose name
All but adoring Love may claim,
 Yet may we reach *thy shrine*;
For, he, thy Son and Saviour, vows
To crown all lowly lofty brows
 With love and joy like thine.

But such things are now done at Oxford, unrestrained either by the Bishop or by the University.

We must, however, return to Dr. Shuttleworth, who cogently inquires:

"Is it, can it be, essential to a sound faith, that we should sur-

render the verdict of our own deliberate judgment in the attempt to understand the plain text of Scripture, merely because a certain number of uninspired human beings, like ourselves, may have thought otherwise?—men not removed, indeed, so far as ourselves from the Apostolic age, in point of time, but perhaps more separated than even we ourselves are at the present day, by the interrupted intercourse of man with man, which prevailed at that period, by the scanty circulation of their literature, and their ignorance of the necessary canons of sound criticism—if we begin to adopt merely human dogmas, solely because they are ancient, where, it will naturally be asked, are we to stop ? ”

Tradition, legitimately employed, is not without its value, as we have already had occasion to remark ; but Tradition must not be raised to a parity with the Scriptures. Where we find the obvious purport of the Scriptures illustrated by the belief and practice of the primitive Church, we allow to the Fathers the high respect which they deserve ; but when we find in them Traditions and Expositions contrary to the obvious purport of the Scriptures, we feel ourselves bound to reject them. It would be a laborious and weary task to illustrate this remark as fully as we might from those voluminous writers ; yet it is one which might be accomplished. When “ Tradition is set up as an integral portion of Revelation,” it is necessary to point out its weakness.

The restriction under which it is now professed to adopt Tradition, according to the already quoted rule of Vincentius of Lirins, is so extensive, “ that if acted upon, it would make the exception entirely exclude the rule ; ” for what doctrines in any way connected with Tradition can be strictly said to have been *always* and *everywhere* and *by all* adopted ? Doctrines of this description flow from the Scriptures, not from Tradition. When we recollect how many at one time adhered to the Arian heresy, the doctrine of the Trinity, which is clearly conveyed to us in the Scripture, cannot claim the sanction of Tradition, according to this rule : the *semper* manifestly falls, and the *ubique* and *quod ab omnibus* will hardly maintain their ground. Yet when it has been found expedient, this rule has been relaxed : “ who, for instance, would ever have supposed that the Church of Rome, with its masses, its image worship, its purgatory, and its indulgences, would gravely appeal to this very test by which to try the validity of a Tradition ? * ” The monstrous allegation, that

* We quote from Dr. Shuttleworth the words of the Romanist Moreri, in his General Dictionary, under the head of Tradition. “ Parmi les Chréticns on distingue deux Moïens de connoître la parole de Dieu et la doctrine de Jesus Christ ; qui sont l’Ecriture

we owe our belief in the Canonical Scriptures to Tradition—or, in other words, that the New Testament itself is but Primitive Tradition, because it has descended through successive generations to our time, is most captious sophistry; for it has descended to us as an acknowledged historical fact, accredited by the Fathers, but not deriving its authority from them; and, as the Doctor says, we may as well call the Pyramids of Egypt a Tradition, as designate the Apostolic writings as one.

The Doctor rightly believes, that not a single particle of Revelation, in the strict meaning of the term, is conveyed to us by Tradition only!—that it is improbable that any portion of the necessary articles of belief should have been originally allowed to remain extraneous to the written Word of God; and that it is certain, that if such portions had been floating in Oral Tradition, the record of them is now irredeemably lost. If, then, the interpretation of the Church is entitled to respect, it is not coercive. The Church of Rome supported many doctrines by its interpretations, such as the well-known deduction of the Pope's supremacy from the *duo luminaria*, mentioned by Bishop Marsh; the defence of image-worship * from the words of the Psalmist, "like as we have heard so have we *seen*," the vindication of the Pope's spiritual and temporal authority from "Lord, here are two swords," and the defence of *penance* from *agite pœnitentiam*, in the Vulgate; though Quinctilian shews that these words mean *to repent* in correct Latinity.† What security have we, that if the present approximation to Romanism be allowed to proceed undisturbed in its course, we shall not be expected to submit to similar outrageous and puerile interpretations! In

Sainte et la Tradition. Les Catholiques les croient tous deux de même autorité; mais il faut comprendre sous le nom de Tradition les écrits des Pères, qui rendent temoignage de la doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique. Et afin que les traditions soient la regle de la Foi, il faut qu'elles aient les conditions marquées par Vincent de Lirins dans son mémoire qui sont l'antiquité, l'universalité, et l'uniformité, qu'il paroisse, que c'est une doctrine enseignée dans toute l'Eglise, en tout tems, et par tous les Docteurs Catholiques. Les traditions, qui n'ont pas ces caractères, sont sujettes à l'erreur, et il ne faut pas se fier à des traditions populaires, dénuées de preuves et de temoins." "Such," says Dr. Shuttleworth, "is the security afforded against the possible adulteration of the Christian doctrine by the adoption of this celebrated canon. Can we, for a moment, question the authenticity and soundness of the Romish Traditions, after their having been tested by so safe a criterion?"

* Dr. Shuttleworth, pp. 91, 92.

† Inst. Orator. Lib. ix. c. 3.

what way in these attempts to improve on the doctrines of the Bible, do the advocates of Tradition act better than the Pharisees with respect to the ritual law of Moses, than the Monks of the Thebaid, and the Ascetics of the middle ages? The attempt has no foundation in revelation, nor is it suited to the circumstances of human nature, nor can it have any effect beyond the revival of the cold superstitions of past times, and the substitution of the abject slavery of external ordinances for the vital religion of Christ.*

In addition to Dr. Shuttleworth and Mr. Holden, Mr. Maurice gives his testimony against these insidious allurements to Popery, and pertinently observes, that these are strange times when the Fathers in Zion are asleep, and the Masters in Israel are dumb; and we perfectly agree with him, that as long as we can have Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, we envy not Dr. Pusey Augustine, and the Fathers; but we have a right to demand that his party will not force them upon us. Dr. Hook, however, avers, that this new sect in the Church is not making a party:—how is it, then, that they confine not their opinions to themselves? how is it that they are commanding the Press as much as they can?—how is it, that at the same time as this number two or three new Magazines proselytizing in the cause will appear? which, with the *British Critic* and *British Magazine* already their own, constitute no unimportant armament? *Is not Dr. Hook himself connected with one of them?* The Bishop of Oxford, too, in his Charge,† admits

* Dr. Shuttleworth.

† Dr. Hook's coarse and unwarrantable attack on Dr. Faussett shows the spirit of the party. It is that of Roman intolerance. Dr. Hook, on the other hand, defends the Bishop of Oxford, who admits that continual though anonymous appeals have been made to him to check the breaches in doctrine and discipline, through the growth of Popery. The Bishop says, that, *after diligent inquiry, he cannot find anything that might be interpreted a breach of discipline in the public services of the Church*; and at pp. 19, 20, expresses himself in a manner which convinces us that he is in heart one of these "*Apostolicals*." His words are, "at the same time so much of what has been objected to, has arisen *from minute attention to the Rubric*, and I esteem uniformity so highly, (and uniformity can never be obtained without strict attention to the Rubric), that I confess I would rather follow an antiquated custom (even were it so designated) WITH the Rubric, than be entangled in the *modern confusions* which arise from the neglect of it." But where in the Rubric is it required that the reading desk be forsaken for the steps of the altar? *Has the Bishop given authority that prayers be read in the Chancel?* has it not occurred to him, that

the fact of well-known irregularity, but contents himself with announcing its cessation; but this is not true; for irregularities are still uncontrouled in his diocese. In our opinion, as far as innovations in the Church-practice occur in the diocese of Oxford, his Lordship should principally be censured; because they could not have continued to this time without his permission, tacit or expressed. Had the Bishop interposed his spiritual authority, the Church of Christ would not have been now rent by schism: to him therefore we justly impute the blame.

It is indeed a most extraordinary act of presumption for anonymous writers to dictate to the whole Church of Christ, whether clergy or laity, and in the midst of one of our Universities to send forth their tracts *ad scholas*, whilst from the circumstance of no effectual check having been given to them, the whole country is set in a feverish excitement. By what right do they disturb our established practices, and why are they permitted thus to abet Popery under the semblance of Churchmen?

“There is something (says Mr. Maurice) very remarkable in the circumstance, that two of the King’s Professors in the University of Oxford should be brought before the public, as prominent characters in those two opposing factions so rampant in the present day—viz.—the Regius Professor of Divinity, and the Regius Professor of Hebrew, both of them canons in the same cathedral, occupying the east and west angles of the large square of our most distinguished college.”

This we grant, with Mr. Maurice, to be very remarkable; but we think it still more so, that the University, which, at the instance of Dr. Pusey, acted with energy against Dr. Hampden, should, in the case of Dr. Pusey himself, and his friends, be completely quiescent. It is, indeed, very remarkable, that *either of them* should *still* occupy an angle of the great square of Christ-Church.

When Mr. Newman, one of the most strenuous of the party, affirms that the blessed Virgin Mary *need have made no offering, as requiring no purification*, calling her the *Mother of God*—the *Deipara* of the Romanists:—and when in the 71st Tract, where the encroachments of Romanism are the subject, we read:

“We can but *honour* all good Romanists for such aggression: it marks their earnestness, *their confidence in their own cause, and their charity* towards those whom they consider in error. We need not be

the right which these men claim for innovation may be claimed by every parish priest in his Lordship’s diocese, and that some may have different and very singular fancies? In such a case, would his Lordship be as ready to urge *the Rubric* in their defence?

bitter against them : We are under no constraint to go out of our way spontaneously to prove charges against the Romanists : We are not *obliged* to prove them incurably corrupt and heretical : no, nor *our own system unexceptionable*,"

is it possible to mistake the drift of the language ?

When we further read of *the English System as at present conducted*; and are informed that we should put into the background the controversy about the Holy Eucharist ; that

"Either the Bishop of Rome has really a claim upon our deference, or he has not; so it will be urged: and our *safe* argument at the present day will lie in *waiving the question altogether*, and saying, that, *even if he has, according to primitive rule*, ever so much authority, (and that he has *some*, e. g. *the precedence of other bishops, cannot be denied*), that it is in matter of faith altogether *suspended and under abeyance*, whilst he upholds a corrupt system against which it is our duty to protest,"

even with the cautionary close of the paragraph, it is impossible to conceal from ourselves the very strongly manifested inclination to Popery. Why are we to *honour* assailing Romanists, who would root us and our memory from the earth? What means *their confidence in their cause*, but a confidence that they will be able to destroy Protestantism? Is that a reason why we should *honour* them? Why are we not *obliged* to prove charges against the Romanists when they seek to bring charges against us? Why are we to remain in indolent security, when our altars are threatened, our personal safety is endangered, and our Church is marked for the spoiler? Why may we not substantiate our own system, and prove their's corrupt and heretical? As we know no *primitive rule* which gives precedence to the Bishop of Rome, we are not under the necessity of waiving the question altogether, and we cannot understand the term "*under abeyance*" as implying less than an acknowledgement of his supremacy, as capable of resumption.

The writer of this dangerous Tract, conceding that the Tridentine decree, which declares, that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints, and that the images of Christ and the Blessed Virgin, and the other saints should receive due honor and veneration, goes to the very verge of what the *cautious* Christian should receive, nevertheless hints in exactly the same papistical spirit, that it may possibly admit of an honest interpretation. How iconolatry, in its direct and positive contradiction to the second commandment, can admit of an *honest* interpretation, we labour in vain to satisfy ourselves. In another part of the Tract, the writer has argued the "*unscripturalness*" of image-

worship as *its only condemnation*, which one would think sufficient, and not deem it necessary to point out the senseless folly of worshipping the works of man's hand; but the writer supposing, that this argument would open the door to a multitude of distinctions and pleas, prefers an appeal to early Church History, the Fathers, &c., as if these had any authority comparable with that of the Word of God.

That our readers may judge how far these writers seem to be attached to the Church of England, we subjoin other extracts from the Seventy-first Tract:

"We may *grant*, in the argument, that the English Church has committed *mistakes* in the practical working of its system; nay, is *incomplete* even in its *formal doctrine and discipline*. We require no enemy to show us the probability of this, seeing that *her own Article expressly states, that the primitive Churches of Antioch and Alexandria, as well as that of Rome, have erred* not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith. *Much more is a Church exposed to imperfection, which embraces but a narrow portion of the Catholic territory, has been at the distance of 1500 to 1800 years from the pure fountains of Tradition (!!!) and is surrounded by political influences of a highly malignant character. The English Church is, for certain, deficient in particulars, because it does not profess itself INFALLIBLE.*"

The explanation given is most Jesuitical; but the words are too plain to require a comment.

On the other hand, there are passages which seem to breathe a contrary spirit—passages which carry with them an appearance of affection to the Church of England; of caution against the Church of Rome. How are we to decide between the two? What are we to think of the hot and cold thus alternately blown? In the advertisement of the Seventy-second Tract, we even read:

"The existence of *Apostolical Tradition* in the early Church, in behalf of the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the like, has been made a pretence of introducing *so-called Apostolical Traditions* concerning various unfounded opinions in faith and practice;"

which is the very charge that we allege against the authors of these Tracts. Must we not think that passages like these are designed to throw us off our guard?

But whilst we have the Scriptures, which clearly develope these leading doctrines, we have no need of resorting to the authority of Tradition; and we do not conceive any one to be in the condition of exhibiting *critical* proofs of the *surviving* state of *Apostolical Tradition*. Too little that is genuine of the *immediate* successors of the Apostles, has withstood the

desolations of ages, to enable us to refer a competent selection from the many floating Traditions to an Apostolical source ; and the writers of the second century can, at the best, be but subordinate authorities, on which we cannot implicitly rely. The strange passages in some of the latter books of Irenæus are conclusive evidences, that we must not discard our judgment for any traditive matter with which this century is fraught.

Opposed to this Oasis-like profession of attachment to the Anglican, and aversion to the Romish Church, stand the following facts. This party is disturbing the unity of the Church, on the credit of writers whose authority will only be admitted in a very qualified degree by many; as they branch out into theories—parties of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos—they open a wide door to the enemies of our Establishment. These Popish, or at least semi-Popish opinions, we conceive incompatible with any station in the Church; and we think, that secession and abandonment of the loaves and fishes would be more honest than treason within the sanctuary.

A most sensible writer in *Fraser's Magazine* has viewed the subject in the same light, (August, 1838), and completely penetrated the occult, but designing plans of this confederacy. He acutely calls to mind the disguises assumed by the Jesuits in the days of Elizabeth and her successors, and adds most properly :

“ We cannot dismiss from our minds the apprehension, that among the leading spirits of this sect, there must exist some one or more who are diligently, *though covertly*, doing the work of the apostate Church, and of her most subtle missionaries, the followers of Ignatius Loyola.”

Such too is our own opinion.

The same writer quotes from these productions another evidence of our allegations:

“ He seeks in the Church an army, small perhaps, but united, organized, uncompromising, and proselytizing, whose noble attitude, and words of high authority, scarce imitated by the crowds around them, would be almost at once his guarantee for joining their warfare, and trusting their guidance. *Would he find this in the Church of England?* Again, it is affirmed, that in the Church of England, ‘ he would not find *authority*.’ ”

We ask, does this language befit the University of Oxford, as Members of the Church of England, and Instructors of her future Clergy? Does the pliant Bishop of Oxford again find an excuse for it *in the Rubric*? If, during the culpable apathy of our spiritual authorities, heresy may thus mature its growth, and the inferior Clergy censure the Church, and innovate on

her forms of worship, we may apply to these times the old doggrel,

“ Ill fares the hapless family that shows
A cock that’s silent, and a hen that crows.”

Many writers, misguided by the profession of adherence to the Anglican Church, which may be discerned occasionally, defend their authors as orthodox; pleased with the assertion of the Apostolical succession, they do not criticise the argument, which seems to be intended to be founded on it. Much less do they view the authority claimed for Tradition in the light in which we view it. Dr. Wiseman claims it, equally with them, in support of his Church: and what *uneducated* man can decide between the claimants? They and Dr. Wiseman may converge so finely on the point that there will be no barrier to prevent the readers of the Tracts from plunging at once into Romanism. If Tradition be valid for the one party, it is valid for the other; and every one who has read the latter Ecclesiastical writers must know, that the Romanists can there directly appeal for many of their Traditions. The authenticity of Tradition should therefore be proved ere it be received: if that authenticity cannot be proved, Tradition should be accounted of inferior importance and no authority where doctrines are concerned.

Mr. Froude “can see *no other claim* which the Prayer-book has on a layman’s deference, as the teaching of the Church, *which the Breviary and Missal have not in a far greater degree.*” What the Breviary is, may be seen in No. 75 of the Tracts; and if its adoration of the Virgin and its invocation of Saints entitle it to a greater degree of deference than the Prayer-book, it is clear that the person who assigns to it that deference, must himself be infected with the Roman superstition.

Mr. Newman, too, on the Arians of the fourth century, says, “Surely the Sacred Volume was *never intended to teach* us our creed, however certain it is, that we can prove our creed from it, *when it has once been taught us*”; which words the Roman Catholic Dr. Wiseman avers *to be sufficient for his purpose*. Here, then, is a recognition of this doctrine by an avowed Papist! But in Froude’s “*Remains*,” the suspicions are so strengthened as hardly to leave the fact in doubt, although the Editor, in his Preface, attempts, by sophistry, to lead us to a contrary inference.* We defy any impartial person to read the

* We submit the following extracts to the judgment of our readers. “I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping of Saints, and honouring the Virgin and Images, &c. *These things may perhaps be idolatrous: I cannot make up my mind about it.*” Vol. I., 294.

passages in the note, without attaining the conviction that Mr. Froude aimed at the establishment of a new sect, and that a Papistical spirit predominated in his mind. In Vol I. p. 336, he states, that he was becoming every day a less and less loyal

“The only thing I can put my hand on as an acquisition is, having formed an acquaintance with a man of some influence at Rome, one Monsignor ———, *the head of the ——— College*, who has *enlightened ——— and me on the subject of our relation to the Church of Rome.*” This, the Editor, in a note, wishes us to understand as a *jest.*—Ib. 306.

“So much for the Council of Trent, *for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers.*”—Ib. 307.

“It has lately come into my head, that the *present state* of things in England makes *an opening for reviving the Monastic System.* I must go about the country to look for the sheep of the true fold: there are many there, I am sure; *only that odious Protestantism sticks in people’s gizzards.* I see Hammond takes that view of the infallibility of the Church, which P. says was the old one. We must revive it.”—Ib. 322.

“Any thing that sets people agog is on our side. I deprecate a calm.”—Ib. 326.

“How do you like my ‘Appointment of the Bishops’? I have sent one on ‘State Interference in matters spiritual.’ Very dry and matter of fact, and *mean to have a touch at the King’s Supremacy.*”—Ib. 328.

“We will have a *vocabularium apostolicum*, and I will start it with four words: *pampered aristocrat, resident gentlemen, smug parsons, pauperes Christi.*”—Ib. 329.

“I wish you could get to know something of S. and W. unise,* *un-Protestantise, un-Miltonize them.*”—Ib. 332.

“We ought to employ itinerant talkers in England: *I am sure I could stir up people very much in Devonshire and Cornwall in that way.*”—Ib. 338.

“You will see it in my letter *The length that I am being pulled on in Anti-Protestantism.*”—Ib. 347.

“Mind to send lots of tracts, for I shall try hard to *poison* the minds of the natives out here. I should like to see a good one (production) on the clergy praying with their faces to the altar and their backs to the congregation. *In a Protestant Church the parson seems either to be preaching the prayers or worshipping the congregation.*”—Ib. 365.

In Yankee-land it is very stupid to insist on the Clergy having no secular avocations: *honest tradesmen, who earn their livelihood, would be far more independent and respectable presbyters than a fat fellow who preaches himself into opulence.*”—Ib. 366.

* *Why is not this word printed at full length?—Would it develope too much?*

son of the Reformation; that we cannot know, that any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome is not a developement of the Apostolic *ἡθoς*; and that "it is to no purpose to say, that we can find no *proof* of it in the writings of

"As to the Reformers, I think *worse and worse of them*: Jewell was what you would call, in these days, an irreverent Dissenter: his Defence of the Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I have read."—Ib. pp. 379, 380.

"When I get your letter, I expect a rowing *for my Roman Catholic sentiments*. Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, *and have almost made up my mind that* the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the Revelations."—Ib. 389.

"I am more and more indignant at the *Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist*; and think that the principle on which it is founded is *as proud, irreverent, and foolish* as that of *any heresy*, even *Socinianism*."—Ib. 391.

"I shall never call the Holy Eucharist *the Lord's Supper*, nor God's Priests *Ministers of the Word*, or the Altar *the Lord's Table*, &c.: innocent as such phrases are in themselves, *they have been dirtied*: nor shall I even abuse the Roman Catholics, *as a Church*, for any thing, except excommunicating us. I have two schemes about the Tracts. 1. I should like a series of the Apostolical Divines of the Church of England. 2. I think *one might take 'The Jansenist Saints,' 'Francis de Sales,' 'The Nuns of Port Royal,' 'Pascal,' &c.*—Ib. 305.

Respecting the Tracts, he writes, "also on the Communion.....you seem cramped by *Protestantism*. However, the wiseacres are all agog about our being Papists. We are Catholics without the Popery, and *Church-of-England-men without the Protestantism*."—Ib. 404.

These passages, many must think, will require no comment; in fact, they breathe a spirit of dissaffection towards the Church of England, an inclination to Popery within certain limits, which cannot be qualified by anything of an apparently opposite tendency, to be found in the volumes. If words have meaning, the author desired the subversion of our existing institutions to be replaced by others, to be devised by these "Apostolicals:" and it is very clear, from the omissions which we have noticed, the numberless "....." which occur in the work, that in his papers he expressed his opinions in a freer manner than it was accounted politic to disclose:—perhaps he too fully developed his ulterior views. It is impossible to separate him from *The Tracts for the Times*: his correspondence and the concluding part of his second volume establish the fact, which is corroborated by the Editor's reference to the Tracts which he wrote, and his anxiety to affix a wholesome explanation to certain expressions. To this we may add, that we have no difficulty in recognizing how far his suggestions were adopted by his friends.

the six first centuries: they must find a *disproof*, if they would do any thing:" on which principle, any nonsense which records exist not to *disprove*, may be accepted, even if its proposers are unable to *prove* that it has ever been a point of faith. In these "*Remains*," there are suspicious omissions; and letters are mentioned by Froude, which are not printed, plainly leading us to surmise that the editor of his papers feared to commit to the public the whole of the unblushing sentiments which he cherished. Innovation and degradation were his objects: the former is proved by the quotations--the latter is apparent in his occasionally scurrilous language, and his idea that the Clergy should not be *gentlemen*. His projected *opusculum*, "A Companion for the Prayer-Book," (V. I. 365.) if the rough notes should be *honestly* published, might plainly develope his views. And at p. 370 we receive an authority to assert that the mode of Episcopal appointment would be one subject of his proposed alterations, since he admits that unless an alteration in this respect should take place, he would be one of the separatists from the Church. We heartily wish, that all his *clique* were *separated* from it. The *Commercial* Clergy, whom he was so anxious to see, would infallibly prove the converse of his own words, "that *εθη* are the hand-glasses, under which *ηθη* grow."

Mr. Froude was one of the writers in *The Tracts for the Times*, and occupies his pages much about them: when, then, he speaks of the only chance of the party being "spoliation on a large scale," (V. I. 396), casts a sarcasm on "*the destroyers of nunneries*," (397) and lauds the *Edinburgh Review* for doing the "*dirty work*" of this party in maligning "Luther, Melancthon, and Co." those, who cannot divine his contemplated plans, must be remarkably dense; and we are exceedingly surprised, that *all* the members of our Church do not see the danger of this schism. The occasional Latin Papistical quotations equally shew the bias of Mr. Froude's mind, as well as his own quotation,

"The age is out of joint. O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right!"

And this bias is fully demonstrated by his irreverent remarks on the Prayer-book. The custom of excommunication and the council of Trent seem to have been his chief objections to Romanism; for we cannot discover any others which were momentous. Independently of these, he was far more of the Romanist than of the English Clergyman; and there is no doubt that all the modifications which he would have introduced into the Church, would have been very closely approximated to

Popery. His Article on the Ancient Liturgies, a task on which Renaudot had long before employed himself, which Article may also be seen in No. 60 of *The Tracts for the Times*, notwithstanding its plausibility and its evidence of the coincidence of certain parts in the distinct sets for more than 1383 years, entirely fails in tracing them to the Apostles, except through Tradition, by which things manifestly impossible might as fairly be proved; so that even in this respect the party is obliged to have recourse to this meagre subsidiary to supply the chasm of centuries; though, on the strength of it, Mr. Froude hesitated not to call the Mass the Liturgy of St. Peter. We are fully persuaded, and think, that we have offered reasons for our persuasion, that the Church is endangered by this party, *these Church of England men without the Protestantism*, or, in other words, *these Church of England men quoad the emoluments*, but not *the principles*. The abuse and sarcasms which have been directed against our reformers, and the undeniable propensity to Romanism, which the writers display, one would think, would be sufficient to prevent the extension of this heresy among the Clergy. May we not say

Aut hæc in nostros fabricata est machina muros,

* * * * *

Aut aliquis latet error?

We have, moreover, observed individuals attached to this school of late busily employed in endeavours to give another illustration to those passages in the New Testament, which have been generally applied to Popery, and to others, which have seemed convertible to their purpose. Opinions as allied to Popery as those of Mr. Froude, the already recited writer in *Fraser* has produced, from Nos. IV. and IX. of these Tracts, and the author too of the *High Church Principles Examined*, (from whom we dissent on a great variety of points, which we shall not interrupt our present paper by discussing), has also brought forward some startling extracts, which present the same suspicious appearance. When, in No. X., we are desired *to be sure* that the Bishop is Christ's appointed representative, *as if we actually saw him work miracles, as St. Peter and Paul did*, that he is Christ's *earthly likeness*, we cannot abandon the thought that the Pope's supremacy flitted before the mind of the author. Who will call MALTBY or STANLEY Christ's *earthly likeness*?

The British Magazine also has the following verses:

O that thy creed were sound,

For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,

By thy unwearied watch, and raised sound*

Of service, in *thy Saviour's holy home*: (Feb. 1836.)

which leads us to exactly the same conclusion respecting the religious principles of these men.

The Author of the *High Church Principles Examined*, seems to be a Dissenter, though he has a national dislike to the Papistical doctrines of the Oriel party: but he has incorrectly handled the arguments, and tested the allegations of the *Tracts* by his own opinions, producing† little or nothing which a critic will allow to be a voucher for those opinions. The main point between us and the *ignes fatui* at Oxford is the validity or invalidity of Tradition; it is the substratum on which the superstructure has been raised: it is that to which the Romanist has equally appealed. This accordingly has been the stand which Drs. Shuttleworth and Wilson, and Mr. Holden, have very properly taken. It must be the stand which every one of common sense will take in this dispute; and there is no point which may be more satisfactorily determined, even if a reference be made to the weary volumes of the Fathers: for their credulity will show that Tradition flowing through their pages cannot be regarded as apostolical.

Bishop Marsh observes, that the rejection of Tradition is the vital principle of the Reformation; hence, those who seek to revive its authority, have expressed themselves in violent terms against the Reformers. The things which Professor Keble says must be abandoned, rather than a surrender of one jot or tittle of primitive faith, "the precious apostolical relics," should take place, viz. "present opportunity of doing good; external quietness, peace, and order; a good understanding with the temporal and civil power; the love and co-operation of those committed to our charge; and all other pastoral considerations," are so very important that it may be most reasonably exacted, that those relics be proved equally precious and apostolical, ere such a surrender be demanded. Dr. Wilson properly remarks, that the authority of any one Father, or that of all the United Fathers, is not apostolical authority; and that their testimony to any doctrine is a matter of credibility, not of faith, unless it be confirmed by the Word of God. We indeed cannot understand how this Tradition, assumed to be pure, is to be proved more genuine than the traditionary rubbish, which may be read in the Patristical pages; for however those who may seek to extract it from the

* *Sound* rhyming with *sound* is very bad.

† From this censure we exempt *Misopapisticus*, whose letters we had not seen when this passage was written.

Mass may be satisfied with their own process, there is no warrant that others will be equally satisfied with it. Dr. Wilson, quoting from Bishop Marsh, has shewn the striking coincidence that subsists between Professor Keble's statements and the Tridentine decree, made at the fourth Session, relating to *Scripture* and *Tradition*, which is singular enough, as the Council of Trent was one of Froude's few objections to Romanism. Our sixth Article, as Bishop Marsh has proved, contradicts the Tridentine decree: instead of proposing "two *partial* rules of faith, viz. *Scripture* and *Tradition*; instead of describing *Tradition*, or the unwritten Word, as *equal* in authority with *Scripture*, or the written Word, it gives the *whole* authority to *Scripture* alone. The sixth Article therefore rejects, entirely and absolutely, *Tradition* as a rule of faith. Hence, perhaps, Froude's antipathy to the Articles.

Have these persons reflected on the moral effect of their doctrine, that *Scripture* alone is not a sufficient instructor? What security have they that the *Traditions* which they may think proper to select and offer to public acceptance, under the name of Apostolical relics, will be received as such? What security have they, that others which *they* may reject, will not be brought forward by another party? Are they not undermining the reverence with which the word of God, as containing all things necessary for our salvation, should be regarded? Professor Keble, however, says, "This use of Apostolical Tradition may well correct the presumptuous irreverence of disparaging the Fathers under the plea of magnifying *Scripture* The very writings of the Apostles were first to be tried by it (*Tradition*) before they could be incorporated into the Canon: they, the *Scriptures* themselves as it were, do homage to the Tradition of the Apostles; *the despisers, therefore, of that Tradition take part, inadvertently or profanely, with the despisers of the Scripture itself.*" We are at a loss for the Professor's *authority* that the *Scriptures* do homage, as it were, to the Tradition of the Apostles; for some of the Apostles having been alive when the three first Gospels and Acts and several of the Epistles were in circulation in the Churches, and St. John having survived to a late period, and added in his own Gospel the things wanting in the others, as long as these living authorities survived, there could have been no need of appeal to a floating Tradition; and ere the despisers of the Tradition which is insisted upon in the present day can be said inadvertently or profanely to take part, as a consequence, with the despisers of the *Scripture* itself, it must be shewn that that Tradition is pure

and identical with the Tradition of the Apostolic times. This is the proof we desire ; but it is one which cannot be given.

Examining Tradition in the sense of *actus tradendi*, Dr. Wilson (of St. Luke i. 1-4), observes :

“ Tradition in its first and essential meaning seems to belong to the Apostles in a sense in which it can never be correctly applied to any one who has not received in the same immediate manner from the fountain head of *authority* that which he *delivers*. If a new revelation were vouchsafed to any one, then would his declaration of it be properly a Tradition ; but that we have no reason to expect any such revelation in matters of faith is evident from Jude, ver. 3.”

The ἀπαξ παραδοθείση τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις appears to preclude the idea of any Tradition independent of the Scriptures as a rule of faith ; it implies a faith *once for all delivered*, that faith which was delivered by the Apostles ; that faith which the Apostles committed to those writings, which we call the New Testament. This act of delivery was τοῖς ἁγίοις to the Church, the faithful in Christ Jesus ; and Tradition “ was the delivery of that which the Apostles had received from their Divine Master, and the Church was the depository to which the deposit was entrusted.” Hence, in Scripture, it is called the pillar and ground of the Truth ;—in our Articles a witness and keeper of Holy Writ.

The early Church made constant appeals to Scripture, and admitted no one doctrine as of Apostolical authority, unless it could be proved from the Scripture. As many like St. Luke had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of the very things most surely believed, “ might not (Dr. Wilson asks) their διηγήσεις be allowed to be *precious Apostolical relics, remains to be guarded with extreme jealousy*,” &c. ? Had they been handed down to us, they would have been more trustworthy than any vehicle of Apostolical Tradition which may now survive ; but as there is no intimation of their uncorrectness or heretical pravity, why were they superseded and lost ? Because, it would seem, they were written by uninspired men, and God willed not that his Church should depend on such traditional testimony : if, then, as this admirable writer urges, these, which would have been the highest and purest channels of Tradition, were, on account of their UNCERTAINTY and SLIPPERINESS, cut off by the interposition of Divine Inspiration, that we might know the CERTAINTY (ἀσφαλεία), of those things, in which the Church was then instructed, apostolic Tradition is closed up in the inspired writings, beyond which, at this distance of time, *no certainty* can be attained. None but God

may dare to raise the curtain which has thus fallen on the *actus tradendi*.

Professor Keble's opinions are very strange:* and we are sure that he would not apply to a profane author the style of criticism which he applies to the New Testament. His notion, that this deposit committed to Timothy contained, besides the substance of Christian Doctrines, a methodical arrangement of the whole, and a certain system of Church Practice, both in government, discipline, and worship, is an extraordinary strain on *παράκαταθήκη*; and as, by the tenor of the argument, all this must have been *oral*, it is, as Doctor Wilson argues, still more singular, that even if St. Paul had not committed it to writing, neither Timothy nor any of his successors should have recorded it, and that it should not have been preserved in the Church of Ephesus, together with the two Epistles, which, in comparison of so important a document, might rather be regarded as private Epistles. Again, this deposit is conjectured to have been a kind of public charge at Timothy's ordination, which he was to entrust to faithful men, (2 Tim. iii. 2); whence it is inferred that it "related principally to *doctrine*." But, who for a moment, can imagine, that the things which Timothy had heard from Paul "*before many witnesses*," the things which he was to commit to faithful men *to teach others also*, were any but the Great Mysteries of the Gospel; the Word, in which, instant in season, and out of season, he was to do the work of an Evangelist, and make full proof of his ministry? Who can

* Professor Keble wishes to prove, that St. Paul left with Timothy *a specific deposit*, a treatise of Apostolical Doctrine, and Church rules—the rules and doctrines which made up the charter of Christ's Kingdom.—P. 20. This deposit is asserted to be something so wholly sufficient, so unexceptionably accurate as to require nothing but fidelity in its transmitters; (p. 21.): a body of truth and duty *totally distinct* from the Scriptures, *and independent* of them; (p. 22.); the substance of saving Truth in a sufficiently systematic form; (p. 23.): something *independent* of the Written Word, and sufficient at that time to refute heresy, *even alone*. (Ib.); to be parallel to Scripture; not derived from it, and consequently *fixing the interpretation of disputed texts*, not simply by the judgment of the Church, *but by authority of that HOLY SPIRIT* which inspired the oral teaching itself, of which such Tradition is the record. (P. 23). The faith once for all delivered to the Saints, in other words Apostolical Tradition, was divinely appointed in the Church, as *the touchstone of Canonical Scripture itself*. (P. 27.): made the *standard and rule* of God's own Divine Scriptures; (p. 28), *to which the Scriptures themselves do homage*. (P. 28.)

possibly believe that when St. Paul says, "I have kept the faith," he meant only that he had been faithful to a certain form of confession and methodized arrangements of general truth? By such language the Apostle could have had no intention, but that of appealing to the whole extent of his ministrations." To us it very clear, from 1 Tim. vi. 20., that the opposition, in which the παρακαταθήκη stands to βεβήλοι κενόφρονιαι and ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, shows that the true Gospel of Jesus Christ, in contrast to Traditions current perhaps amongst the Jewish Christians of that day and the Gnosis, was intended by the Apostle. We cannot be expected to follow Professor Keble into all his other allegations, which Doctor Wilson has triumphantly disproved. As if to support his assertion, the Professor, however, says, "To these conclusions we are led by the consideration, first, that the truths and rules committed to Timothy's charge, were, at the time, almost or wholly unwritten." But Dr. Wilson shews, according to Greswell, that six of St. Paul's Epistles had been written TEN years when he sent the second Epistle to Timothy: those to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Philippians, almost six years; that to the Hebrews, THREE; that to Titus, ONE; the Gospel of St. Matthew, FOUR AND TWENTY years; of St. Mark at least TEN; of St. Luke, six years. Consequently, the Apostle, by having made no particular reference to these Gospels or his own Epistles, considered the whole Canonical Scriptures as the rule of faith, just as the Writings of the Old Testament had been the rule and criterion of the Apostolical preaching: hence, the general precept, μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκάλειν.

The authority cited from the Fathers is quite as felicitously overthrown by Dr. Wilson, who, in return, cites Cyril of Alexandria, as stating that Christ is the Truth, "i.e. the true rule, end, and object of faith, ὁ ἀληθὴς τῆς πίστεως ὅρος. In the Appendix he has given an instance of amplification in the Translation, where the argument rests on the amplification; the words are οἱ τοίνυν ἐπίσκοποι λοιπὸν ἀνελόντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπινοηθέντα ῥήματα οὕτως ἐξέθεντο κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν ὑγιαίνουσαν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὴν πίστιν; which Professor Keble renders, "on the other [part] the Bishops rejected the expressions devised by them, and proceeded to enunciate against them the sound faith, the faith of the Church from the beginning." Here the insertion of *proceeded*, and *from the beginning* is clearly designed to support the views of Tradition. Were all the quotations of this school to be carefully examined, similar instances might probably be found.

When we are further informed that this treasure, the identical

deposit, is lost, but must be recovered; that the genuine Canons of the primitive Councils, and the genuine "fragments of the primitive Liturgies must be searched for "the remnant of Apostolical Tradition,"—whom are we to depute to the "overwhelming task?" With whose critical judgment shall we be satisfied? Whom shall we trust "not only to purify but integrate" a mutilated and corrupted text? And when this shall have been done, who will or can prove the Apostolical authority of the sifted matter?—excepting as far as it may coincide with the Inspired Word. Moreover, we are required to establish a "consent among the Fathers, as to unquestionable relics of the Apostles;" but if Apostolical Tradition cannot be established until this shall have been effected, we may continue for ever in the good path which we have trodden. For it must be manifest to every one who has read the varying interpretations of the Fathers, and who has waded through their discrepant Traditions, that they cannot be conciliated without extensive mutilations and conjectural emendations; and very few will be inclined to elevate the conjectures that will be required for this purpose to the standard of the *Inspired* Scriptures. As Dr. Wilson says, the Fathers not only disagree in interpretation, but exhibit instances of manifestly unsound critical judgment, and often seem to quote Scripture for the mere sake of illustration.

Dr. Wilson has also glanced at the Apostolical succession, on which subject his opinion coincides with our own. The Apostolical character of the doctrines of the Church is most evident; but can the Apostolical succession be traced through all the links of the chain? We suspect that many interruptions would present themselves to the critical inquirer, and are sure, that the doctrine propounded has been intended to direct us to the Church of Rome, as that through which it might be traced. It has been a bait offered to the weak-minded and self-important. The twenty-third Article of the thirteenth of Elizabeth, about the admission of persons below the Episcopal dignity, who had been otherwise ordained into the Church, is not greatly in favour of Apostolical succession as now understood. Even in the Church of Rome the dictum, "*ubi vox apostolorum sonat, ibi cathedræ apostolorum præsidet*," makes not this succession of place or persons independent of a succession of doctrine. Our Church, in maintaining the succession of doctrine is right; and *in this sense*, we may fearlessly assert the Apostolical succession, for it is built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; but if we attempt to maintain an unbroken and successive Priesthood, we shall not be able to establish our proposition.

The notion of an Apostolical succession, in its strictest and plenary sense, is a part of the foundation of the system which we are discussing, and we can easily imagine that it is calculated, by inflaming spiritual pride, to make proselytes. Nevertheless, the abettors of the notion are bound to produce the *unbroken* chain, not through Rome; for there it has been *broken* by a deflection from Apostolical doctrines, and Rome scarcely otherwise could exhibit it; much less can it be proved through the native Britons, said to have been converted by St. Paul; for the records are far too scanty for such an important purpose, and there was a time when the Romish defection from Apostolicity prevailed in this land. It is, however, curious to perceive the inclination towards infallibility, which we detect in Froude and some others, in connection with this notion.

By the aid of Mr. Maurice's pamphlet, we are also enabled to notice some innovations in practice, which have a very dangerous and papistical tendency. Some of them appear to have resulted from Froude's suggestions. Speaking of the new mode in which the service of the Church has been performed by certain Ministers, he says, that the officiating Minister "kneels on a low cushion placed on the step of the Communion-table, and turns from the Congregation *with his face towards the Communion-table*, in which practice he continues during the prayers." This is exactly the practice which the Roman Catholics adopt, and cannot be misunderstood, as indicating a closer approximation to the Church of Rome than can be consistent with the safety of the Church of England. In a new Chapel of Ease belonging to St. Mary the Virgin, at Oxford, the same practice is observed, according to Mr. Maurice, who properly describes the nakedness of the interior, divested of its reading-desk;—may we not ask, when the Bishop consecrated this Chapel, could he have failed to notice the irregularity? Did *he* authorize the change?

In this Chapel the lessons are read from a small moveable desk, which just contains the Bible; and the prayers are offered from a small octavo prayer-book, the Clergyman kneeling on the step of the Communion-table, with his face turned from the people towards the East. A plain cross rises up and projects out of the wall from the centre of the Communion-table: in the central division of the Eastern window is a pane of glass "like a drop of blood polluting the whole," which is a representation of an ornamental cross or crosslet. Within the rails of the Lord's table is a second table or sideboard to receive the elements, until the Priest shall place them *upon the table* for consecration.

We again affirm, that there can scarcely be a nearer approach to Popish practices than these unauthorized changes of our

mode of performing the service: nor doubt we, that if they be unchecked, greater liberties will be taken, and that it will not be long ere images, tapers, and all the abominations of the Roman idolatry desecrate our Churches. Things are rapidly progressing to this evil. Mr. Maurice adds, that the innovation is not confined to the Churches; but that even *in the Chapel* of one of the most distinguished Colleges at Oxford, the cross, which was in use in the reign of Edward the Sixth, has made its appearance. It is thus described by Mr. Maurice:

“It is a long strip of silk about two inches and a half in width, thrown over the left shoulder, where it is fastened by a pin or button, and extends downwards to the bottom of the surplice, before and behind, with a fringe of the same material at each end, and a cross of black silk raised and embossed just above the fringed border, the arms of the cross being extended cornerwise, or in the shape of the Martyr’s or St. Andrew’s Cross.”

Might not any Clergyman, according to his fancy, by exactly the same right, revive any of the obsolete dresses?—If so, may not our dresses become as parti-coloured as a clown’s at a pantomime? It is justly inquired, if the Bishop has given his sanction to these proceedings:—we affirm, that unless he *prevent them*, he is responsible for their consequences; and that if he trouble himself not about them, the Clergy in general should appeal to the Archbishop of the province. When, in addition to these things, we notice attempts to defend prayers for the dead, are we wrong in dreading that this new system will ultimately merge into Popery?

Since the preceding part was written, we have received the letters of Misopapisticus, which have some remarks that are very powerful, satisfactory, and most deeply argumentative. The subject is too important to be disregarded in any branch; and the light in which this writer has placed it is sufficient to shew the invalidity of Tradition, and the very small authority of the Fathers in many respects. We do not approve of the latitude of many of his views; but separating them from his proofs, we consider his letters unanswerable as to patristical authority. He perceives, with ourselves, that the doctrine of Apostolical succession has been the allurements by which many have been drawn into these opinions, and rightly shows, that Hooker, Cranmer, Wake, and other worthies of our Church, had opposite sentiments on the point: for, as Apostolical succession must rest upon Tradition, its admission will wholly, or in great part, cause the admission of Tradition as an authority.*

* We select from this work some of the absurdities contained in

It is very manifest from Polycarp, and the history of his martyrdom, that nothing was sanctioned at that time by the Orthodox Church but what *the Scriptures* taught; consequently, that no Tradition which cannot bear the test of the Scriptures

the Fathers. In the Second Epistle of Clemens, which is generally accounted spurious, but thought genuine by Archbishop Wake, we read, the Lord himself being asked, "when his kingdom should come," answered, "*when two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female,*"—the explanation of which by Clemens is even more absurd than the Tradition. In Barnabas and Hermas, the trifling is still worse. When Ignatius talks of his own soul as the *expiatory offering* for the Church of Ephesus, of the virginity of Mary, and the birth and death of Christ having been kept secret from the Prince of this world, and of all the stars, with the sun and moon having been the chorus to the star which guided the Magi; when also he describes the Saints drawn up on high by the Cross of Christ, as *by an engine*, using the Holy Ghost *as the rope*, and calling himself the wheat of God, says, that he shall be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, that he may be found the *pure bread of Christ*—we not only observe much which must be rejected, but have evidence, that Traditions passing through the hands of one so fanciful and extravagant cannot be relied upon. Justin Martyr too, one of the most learned Fathers, in more places than one, affirms, that God at first entrusted the earth to angels, some of whom (Gen. vi. 1, 2.) cohabiting with women, begot demons; which *Tradition* we know to be a Jewish fable. Athenagoras and Irenæus likewise appealed to the same Tradition. How many others then may have been equally corrupt? In his interpretation of the Scriptures Justin often errs; he makes some things *prophetical* and others *typical*, which were never intended to be so, and carries his fancy to a ridiculous extent; if he and other Fathers, who are censurable on the same ground, are claimed as the *traditive* interpreters, who are to be consulted for the sense of the New Testament, we imagine the best refutation would be in a selection of their interpretations. Irenæus is equally prone to speculation in some parts of his writings, and interprets Scriptural passages in a manner that is self-evidently ridiculous. He reports, that our Lord informed St. John, St. John certain elders, and elders who had seen St. John recorded, that "*the days (the millennium) shall come in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and on each shoot ten thousand clusters, and on each cluster ten thousand grapes, each grape, when pressed, shall yield twenty-five kilderkins (metretas twelve gallons) of wine. And when any one shall lay hold of any of these holy clusters, another will cry, I am a better cluster; take me; by me bless the Lord.*" THIS IS TRADITION! On the subject of Baptism, some of the Fathers were very wild; Gregory Nazianzen and others allotted infants, who died unbaptized, a middle state, which was neither Heaven nor Hell; Tertullian said, that the baptismal waters

should be accepted. Misopapisticus, after his Survey of the Apostolical Fathers, cogently asks : “ *if these writings contain no Traditions, either as to doctrines or practices, where are they to be found?* ” On their silence Dr. Shuttleworth’s argument, that the first link of the chain is wanting, is also based. In many places the Fathers were very excellent ; but in others they were very wild and foolish ; and were certainly unfitted for the conveyance of *pure* Tradition. When we read in Irenæus, L. iii. c. i., that what the Apostles preached, they *tradited* (tradiderunt) to us in the Scriptures, and that as they went forth evangelizing the earth, each and all had the Gospel of God (omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei) we cannot imagine *oral* instructions independent of the Scriptures to have been entrusted by them to the custody of the Churches. Two passages respecting the heretics quoted by Misopapisticus from Irenæus, most remarkably apply to the present controversy : the first is in L. ii. c. 54 : “ for these (the heretics) are not more competent (to teach the truth) than the Scriptures. Nor ought we to leave the words of our Lord, and Moses, and other Prophets, and to believe those who say nothing that is sane, but dote on unstable things.” The other is in Lib. iii. c. 2 : “ When they (the heretics) are reprov’d from the Scriptures, they turn to find fault with the Scriptures, as if they were not right, or were not of authority, both because they are variously expressed, *and because the truth cannot be found from them by those who are ignorant of Tradition ; for that was not delivered by means of WRITING, but by word of mouth.* ” When Irenæus traces the succession up to the Apostles, maintaining

are medicated through the intervention of an Angel ; and in allusion to a well-known fanciful acrostic (ἰχθῦς) we continually find ἰχθῦς, or *pieces*, or *pisciculi* applied to the Christians, and *piscina* to the font. The Fathers also strangely varied in their interpretations : Chrysostom called the Baptism of Fire *the superabundant graces of the Spirit* ; Basil and Theophilus, *the fire of Hell* ; Cyril, Jerome, and others, *the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost* ; Hilary, *a fire, that the righteous must pass through on the day of judgment*. Ambrose thought, that *John the Baptist will administer the baptism of fire at the gate of Paradise*, which he identified with *the flaming sword*. (Gen. iii. 24.) Origen and Lactantius affirmed, that it is *a river of fire* at the gate of Heaven, whose liquid flames will divide to give the righteous a free passage, and that Christ will stand at the brink to receive them, &c. &c. (See Maurice, p. 63.) If those men thus received such stupid Traditionary fictions, must not we be equally stupid, if we trust to them as custodiers of Tradition of a purer nature ?

that the Tradition or delivery of the Truth had continued the same from the beginning, "he completely shuts out oral Tradition," because, what the Apostles preached and poured into the Church, they delivered to us in the Scriptures—and thus the Tradition, which had remained inviolate, was the Scriptures themselves. He could not have alluded to any oral Tradition as a rule of faith; otherwise, Lib. iv. c. 66, he could not have asserted, that *every doctrine* (omnem doctrinam) was contained in the Gospel and the Prophets. Justin's Advice (Apol. i. 2.) that we should value and love only what is true, *declining to follow the opinions of the ancients, if they be worthless*, is very sensible.

In opposition to the doctrine of a transmitted Oral Tradition, Misopapisticus quotes the words of Bishop Burnet on the 6th Article in evidence, that this is not the doctrine of the Anglican Church. The 20th Article describes the Church *as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ*: in Mr. Newman's Lectures *she is the keeper and witness of Catholic Tradition*. Mr. Newman's argument, which would hold equally good respecting the Jewish Traditions, that we use Tradition to establish the *Divinity* of the Scriptures, and receive through it both the Bible itself, *and the doctrine that is divinely inspired*, will receive an answer in Bishop Burnet's words on the 6th Article.

"A great difference is to be made between all this and the oral Tradition of a doctrine in which there is nothing fixed or permanent, so that the whole is only report carried about and handed down. Whereas, here is a book that was only to be copied and read publicly, and by all persons; between which the difference is so *vast*, that it is as little possible to imagine how the one (*Tradition*) should continue pure, as how the other (*Scripture*) should come to be corrupted."

Again:

"The authority of these books is *not derived from any judgment that the Church made concerning them*, but from *this*, that it was known that they *were writ*, either by men who were themselves the Apostles of Christ, or by those who were their assistants and companions."

When also, it is considered how strongly our Saviour condemned Traditions and Commandments of men, and how he and his Apostles appealed to the *written Word*; and when we examine the existing evidence that the *παράδοσις* inculcated by St. Paul, were those which are embodied in the written Word of the New Testament, it is strange, that with respect to oral Tradition Christians should have fallen into precisely the same errors as the Jews. For Maimonides attempted in an exactly similar manner on the authority of the Talmudical writers to retrace the Jewish traditions to the times of Moses, and had

even the hardihood to name the custodiers through whom it descended.

But the first Homily has been cited in defence of Tradition: strangely indeed; for it speaks of "*the stinking puddles of men's Traditions.*" An old Canon made in 1571 has also been pressed into the service; but THAT only mentions "what the Catholic Fathers and Bishops collected *from the Doctrine of the Old and New Testaments*, and what they transmitted down by *Oral Tradition* from the Apostles." The Canon says, "*articuli illi religionis Christianæ haud dubie collecti sunt ex sacris libris veteris et novi Testamenti,*" and in the concluding part, "*Vanas et aniles opiniones, et hæreses, et errores pontificios, à doctrinâ et fide Christi abhorrentes non docebunt.*" The adoption of Creeds has been as singularly claimed as an argument; they were not, however adopted *on account of Tradition*, but (as our Article says) because they ought to be thoroughly received and believed, for they may be proved by the most certain "warrants of Holy Scripture."

Basil excellently said, that it is a manifest fall from the faith, and the clear vice of pride, either to refuse any of the things contained in the Scriptures, or *to introduce any thing that is not written.* Many of the things called Traditions by the Fathers, either do not prove, or they attempt to prove by apocryphal documents: yet, as Dr. Wilson affirms, that which is practically denied to Scripture by the advocates of Tradition is peremptorily required in their own cause:—"and a higher character is asserted of those portions, than such advocates will concede to any inspired fragment, *that they are complete in themselves.*"

Mr. Maurice informs us that the Regius Professor of Hebrew, in addition to the lectures belonging to his Professorship, gives others on the Types and *Prophecies*, and that Mr. Newman has been in the habit of making use of his Church for the purpose of delivering lectures on Romanism—his assembly chiefly consisting of students. Were such things done at Cambridge, we are convinced that the University would interfere. If, then, the principle of Tradition, on which this system is founded, be worthless, who can calculate on the mischief that will thus be done among those whom Oxford is training for the Church? Who can avoid the conviction that an extensive division or a great secession must soon take place? Are not the young Nobility, and those intended for the Lower House of Parliament, who are entrusted to the University, in equal danger of acquiring an inclination to Romanism? Coupling these things with Mr. Maurice's account of the increase of Popery itself in Oxford and its vicinity, we will quote to the Clergy once more Dr. Wilson's words—"Nay,

it is our duty, as Ministers of a Protestant Reformed Church, boldly to raise the cry ‘To your tents, O Israel;’ and if you see here a fundamental principle of your Church subverted, one of the strong-holds of your Zion betrayed, quit you like men, and contend for the truth, on which alone the Protestant Faith can rest:—the ABSOLUTE, ENTIRE, AND FULL SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.”

The preceding remarks will suffice to shew, that Dr. Shuttleworth, Dr. Wilson, and Mr. Holden must be allowed to have proved their points in the judgment of every impartial person; but we shall not in this number conclude our notice of their works. Our knowledge of abuses has been very much increased by Mr. Maurice, and the keen argument and deep research of Misopapisticus have greatly availed us. Dr. Hook’s Visitation Sermon is one which proves his addiction to the party at Oxford, which would introduce alterations into our system; and his treatment of the defenders of our institutions and long received opinions, as if *they* were the authors of the schism—as if *they* too, as watchmen, had no right to sound the alarm, when they perceived danger—shews him to be both mistaken, and intemperate. When we read:*

“And where are we to look for unity and union, if we find it not here? And what terms of reprobation can be sufficiently strong to designate the conduct of those, who, by causing discord among brethren, who in principle are united, would thereby make music for our enemies? Alas! in every community such persons are found to exist, *whose element is strife, who live by faction;*”

it is evident, that with the exception of *union in principle*, he is describing the Church of England men without Protestantism, *who began the altercation and disunion*. The charge is absolutely contrary to the fact: the same might have been formerly as correctly applied to the opponents of the Wesleys and Whitefields, who were equally members of the Established Church. Hence the principle of the charge would appear to be, that we must not oppose innovations by members of our own body; that doing so, we cause discord among the brethren, and live by faction. But if this principle be adopted, what heresies may we not expect?

As for ourselves, we are contented to receive the Scriptures as a sufficient and infallible guide. We want not the aid of Tradition to direct us in the study of them. We are contented, as† we have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so to walk in him, rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, *as we have*

* See note K. and P. 169 of this Sermon. † Col. ii. 6-8.

been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving, careful, lest any man spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit, after the Tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. We will allow no man to judge us in meat or drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath;† much less will we be guiled into worshipping of angels, and into those things with which men of vain imaginations and worldly minds are puffed up. Persevering in the principles of the Reformation, submissive to the wholesome discipline of our Church, and discarding all rules of faith independent of the Scriptures, we are satisfied to continue in that good old way, in which the word of God has been a light unto our feet, and a lamp unto our path.*

General Literature.

The Reformation a Direct Gift of Divine Providence ; a Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Monday, October 8, 1838, on the first day of the Visitation of the Right Hon. and Right Rev. Charles James, Lord Bishop of London. By GEORGE CROLY, LL.D., Rector of St. Stephens, Walbrook, London: Duncan. Third Edition. 1838.

THIS Sermon offers many important points to our consideration, and is original in its views. "The argument is, that Judæism and Christianity being confessedly given to the world by the Divine will; the Reformation, given to the world under circumstances closely similar, is, like them, to be regarded as a direct work of Heaven."

Independently of our wish to exhibit prominently to our readers the merits of this composition, we gladly avail ourselves of its subject to enable us to refute an ill-grounded charge, which has been circulated, that our Review is one of the organs of the Oxford Re-modellers of our discipline. If we may accept Mr. Froude's hatred of the Reformation as the sentiments of the two individuals connected with the Tracts, who edited his "Remains," it will be clear that the veneration in which we hold the Reformation, must be inconsistent with the principles of this party. We are perfectly aware that very many of the Theological Reviews are devoted to this school; and we are aware of the endeavours which are employed to prepossess the Press in its favour; but we wish our readers most distinctly to

* Col. ii. ver. 16.

† Ibid. ver. 18.

understand, that we are not given to change, and that the principles of the Reformation are those which will be seen in our pages.

Dr. Croly, considering the removal of the family of Jacob to Egypt as a providential security against the warlike tribes of Palestine, till the time of their possession of the promised land, and the Egyptian tyranny, as a mode of violating their ancient compact with the Israelite, of forcing him from his natural occupation, and of making him a labourer in his fields and cities, of giving him new knowledge, quickening his understanding, making him feel his wants, and teaching him a familiarity with the forms of civilized life, the effects of which reluctant education were afterwards seen, traces through the series of events the guidance of Divine Providence. Christianity was equally preceded by a preparatory discipline. The victories of Alexander, by which the Greek literature became known to the Orientals, the Septuagint Version, which had its influence even on the Jew, and the knowledge of the subtleties of the Greek Philosophy, which the Asiatic had acquired, were among the causes preparatory to its effects; but, during the Augustan age, when intellectual pursuits engrossed intellectual minds at Rome; and when all the acuteness of the Greek sophists was in its highest vigour, Christianity, "the especial religion of evidence, of argument, of learned research, and of intellectual freedom was given to the human understanding, especially awakened, invigorated, and refined."

Still was the third great interposition to come. Christianity had decayed in the long lapse of a thousand years: a distinct and appropriate preparation ushered in its revival at the Reformation. The deep lethargy in which the human mind was sunk from the sixth to the fifteenth century, was dispelled by a sudden burst of intellectual splendour; in the *midst* of this period Constantinople fell; and that catastrophe, which appeared to bow Christendom beneath the Turk, was the primary cause of European civilization. "By the fall of the Greek Empire, its learning, the old stimulant of the human understanding, was suddenly spread anew through the West":—new discoveries were opened on the human race, and increased knowledge was poured in far and wide; and the German Reformation was given.

"Still there is an obvious distinction in the three disciplines":—the Jewish Revelation had such a substantial evidence of its divine origin, and so direct an appeal to the testimony of the senses, that there was but little ground for the exercise of the reason; but in Christianity the exercise of

the understanding was demanded, and the reason was singularly subtilized. In the third instance a similar intellectual discipline, by means also of Greek learning, was provided for the revival of Christianity. The three interpositions were distinguished, too, by another characteristic. In each the religion was soon removed from its birth-place to one of security: the Judæism which commenced with the mission of Moses, was shortly removed from Egypt, and established in Palestine, under the protection of God, as the King of Israel—Thus Christianity too was speedily removed from Judæa, and fixed in the Christian empire of the East, in a capital expressly constructed for its throne, under the charge of Constantine; thus Protestantism also was soon transferred from the divided and exposed province of Germany to England, under the tutelary care of Elizabeth.

The third great characteristic is, that the kingdom to which each revelation was primarily given, endured exactly until the arrival of a subsequent interposition. Exposed as Judæism was to unexampled vicissitudes, captive, and almost lost Judah again came forward as a kingdom: she saw the Assyrian, Persian, and Macedonian empires decay; yet, whilst her Imperial oppressors arose no more, she continued, in verification of a prophecy, for a period more enduring than had ever before, or has been since conceded to an earthly sovereignty. The limit was reached, and the purpose was complete, when the Messiah came, and Christianity was given to the world. Then passed away the kingdom amidst the out-pouring of Divine judgments, and the soil was abandoned to the successive desolations of the Roman, the Saracen, and the Tatar.

As the Western Empire perished almost immediately after the Imperial recognition of the Gospel, the Eastern, though torn by faction, undergoing the heaviest vicissitudes, and the sport of most frantic heresies, swept by the Mahomedan Simùm, and crushed by the iron masses of the Crusaders, still stood the “fated empire: the throne of the Constantines, continually assailed from the East and the West, and continually on the point of perishing, stood until the very eve of the third interposition.” In the sepulchre, as it were, of that corrupted empire, “the solitary lamp of the Gospel had survived to be carried to the West. Constantinople was stormed, and the Greek sovereignty fell; but not until the moment when its successor was prepared: it expired with its hand on the gates of the Reformation. “In the instances of Judæism and Christianity, to signalize the Divine judgment, the places of these religions and sovereignties were filled by those which were the most especially abhorred by them. “The Roman and his hated idolatry

were planted in Jerusalem—the Turk and his scorned Islamism were planted in Constantinople:—a startling lesson to all nations which neglect the great gift of God.” From hence Dr. Croly, alluding, as we imagine, to the vigorous attempt which is unceasingly made, to bring us again under bondage to the yoke of galling ordinances, asks what is there in our condition to make us more contemptuous of change than Judah, the Kingdom of God? “What in our narrow and remote island, so new-born from the errors of superstition, *and with a Church forced to a daily struggle against their return*, to counteract that law by which Judah and Constantinople have been stripped of their tiaras, and sent naked to the tomb;—the mighty put down from their seat, and the rich sent empty away?”

That the fate of the Jew and Greek awaits England, “if like them, she shall dilapidate the mighty treasure of truth entrusted to her hands,” the preacher urges, with great reason; and are we not at this time in danger of corruption from the poison which flows from one of our Universities?

The characters of those employed in each interposition of Providence are compared, as another evidence of the connexion. The first commenced with the call of Moses, a shepherd in the wilderness; the second with the Son of Man, who came, as an obscure Israelite, wholly unconnected with the public excitement of the times; the third with Luther, an Augustinian monk: the first was transmitted to the temporal guardianship of the God of Israel—the head of the Theocracy; and was finally fixed by the Divine command in the Jewish Hierarchy, the stateliest of all establishments; an irrefragable proof of the Divine appointment of a national religion:—the second was at length transmitted to the care of the first Christian Emperor, and was embodied in the established church of the Empire, and had kingdoms as its dioceses: the third found its protection in a British sovereign, and devolved its duties on the Church of England, the chief of the Protestant Churches. The chronology is equally striking: Judæism arose nearly fifteen hundred years before Christianity; and the revival of Christianity by the Reformation was nearly fifteen hundred years afterwards: thus Christianity, by Heaven’s especial agency, stands in the central point of the three thousand years.

A more masterly Sermon than this has never been written; and its concluding parts, which we shall notice in our Ecclesiastical Report,* deserve the most patient attention. Neither acerbity, nor palliation of political facts; neither a disguise of

* To this Report we refer our readers.

the movements against the Church, and the objects of those who direct them; nor a falsely coloured or clumsily varnished *pourtraiture* of existing affairs disfigure the solemnly exciting lessons which it conveys. It is a sermon which it became an orthodox Clergyman, grounded in the faith, and not tossed about by the blasts of popular opinion, to write; a sermon to which it will become every reader to attend.

Scriptural Studies. By the Rev. WM. HILL TUCKER, M.A.,
Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London: Smith,
Cornhill. 1888.

CONTRARY to our usual practice, we notice this work a second time, not for the purpose of reviewing it, but of vindicating ourselves from the extraordinary charges which this writer has made against us in a letter. The press would indeed be basely managed, if it were applied to the mean task of favoritism, and lauding authors who are justly censureable. If a Reviewer cannot write according to the dictates of his conscience, but must bend before every theory which he meets, those who look to his decisions on works, will be continually led astray, and his review will be nothing better than knavery.

The whole of the first chapter of Genesis cannot, without a most violent misinterpretation, be separated in its several historical parts: it is a continuous account of the creation from its commencement to its completion. It is therefore impossible to reconcile the idea of prior earths, or prior states of this earth, with the Mosaic narration: the term *בראשית* is clear evidence that Moses goes back to the very beginning of the creation. When then we see theory which cannot be reconciled with the plain words of the Scripture, the question naturally arises, are we to give credit to the Scripture, as that which was divinely inspired? or are we to set aside its authority for modern speculations, though they be dignified with the name of *facts*? For, notwithstanding the utmost ingenuity of sophistry, we must do the one or the other.

As to our charge of proximity to profaneness, we leave the following passage respecting the opponents to the geologists who have attacked the Bible, to the reader's judgment:

"They have taken early impressions and the faith of their forefathers, as the leading principle of their opposition, and imagined with a feverish anxiety—*laudable to a certain extent and conscientious*—that aught that is contrary to ancient opinions, is injurious to the truth. *But, what is this in its naked reality, than the spirit of the Scribe and the Pharisee in the age of our Saviour?*—the spirit that would stifle

inquiry, and bring truth within the narrow circle of their own acknowledged creed? The Jew of that period adhered to a mode of faith, which had been received and recognised as divine during fifteen centuries. A time arrived, when the wisdom of God demanded an enlargement of men's belief:—a new law was laid open, and imposed upon them; but their mind reverting to the faith of their forefathers, joined to the conviction that it was the truth, refused the doctrine, which seemed to sap the foundation of the old covenant, and through the force of prejudice rejected even the Son of God. *The animosity to science, acting, it is true, on a lesser plane, is, WE REPEAT, but a revival of this spirit.*"

Whether this comparison of the pretensions of Geology over the Mosaic cosmogony to the superiority of Christianity over the Mosaic Ordinances, whether the rejection of Geology, as compared to the rejection of the Son of God by the Jews, be or be not profane, every one must determine for himself. We offer no comment on this passage, which we partially quoted before.

We are charged with having objected to the author's Hebrew criticisms without the production of proof. Urging, that **בראשית** is indefinite, he says, "*the time when these heavenly systems were created, is not specified.....it might have been myriads of ages before the formation of the earth, that the stars first sprang into being, and the heavens were created:*" but, it is not only certain from the first verse, that the heavens and the earth were created at the same time, but the particularization of the elastic form of the earth, which is connected by **ו** with the first verse, shows, that the notion here suggested is in direct contradiction to the sacred narrative. If, according to Moses, the stars were not created until the fourth day, and if the earth was created on the first, who can argue us unfair in maintaining, that the theory which propounds the creation of the stars *at myriads of ages before the formation of the earth*, can never be reconciled with Moses? Mr. Tucker in vain seeks to ensconce himself behind the plea, that "the interpretation now given would reduce them (the acts attributed to God in the commencement of Genesis) to a re-modelling of old and confused materials;" that therefore we must suppose the earth to have been destroyed, and the world reduced to its pristine chaos, in which state it revolved for many years round the sun, thus allowing the time which the Geologist requires for his strata; for all this is in opposition to the scriptural records, and the determination of the fourth day as the period of the sun's creation. Mr. Tucker certainly states his objections to this latter theory; but he impresses on us, that the Bible is not a scientific record. When he affirms that Moses wrote of two creations, for which he appears to have had no better reason

than the occurrence of אלהים *simply* in the first chapter, and the augmentation of the Divine Title into יהוה-אלהים in the second, which fact the German theologians have adduced as proofs of different codices, from which Moses borrowed, and appears, if we understand him aright, to apply this notion of two creations to man himself, on the authority of the first, second, and fifth chapters, we assuredly have not erred in pronouncing him favourable to those geological speculations which are contrary to the Bible. But it is evident that Gen. ii. 4-39 continues and refers to the preceding account, and is not distinct from it; the details are more amplified; yet, on this account, the period of the animal creation is not different. The inference from Chap. v., 1, 2, is equally untenable. The first verse mentions the creation of Adam alone, as in the former chapter (ברא עשה אֶת־אָדָם), and the second includes the creation of Eve; and so far from referring to a distinct occurrence, it has nearly the same words as Gen. i. 27, which verse, compared with the fuller history in ii. 21. sqq. will satisfy every impartial person, that these chapters recapitulate but one and the same event; especially since זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאִם must include the more diffuse detail. When Mr. Tucker also assents to an interval of *millions of years*, for which the Bible gives no warrant, how can he expect us to eulogize his book?

In our opinion, we have treated him, and now treat him very gently; and dismiss the subject, as one of no interest to our readers, or of pleasure to ourselves; but at the same time affirm, that were we severely to criticize the book, the writer might more fully appear prepossessed rather than in favour of geology than of the veracity of Moses.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, in August and September, 1838, at the Triennial Visitation of the Right Reverend James Henry Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Published at the request of the Clergy. London: J. G. and F. Rivington. 1838.

THIS is a very interesting charge in many points of view, and is extended to a greater length than usual with publications of this description. It treats of most of the important subjects connected with the Church at the present day. Although we do not agree with the learned prelate in some of his opinions respecting the ecclesiastical commission, yet we cannot but observe, that it would be impossible for any one to peruse his charge without feeling deeply impressed by the truly courteous,

dignified, and Christian spirit which it breathes throughout. His Lordship commences, by making some affecting allusions to a weakness of sight under which he is labouring. We cordially sympathize with him in this affliction, and hope it will be but temporary. The first subject, to which the Bishop adverts, is the Ecclesiastical Commission, of which his Lordship was a member. He endeavours to defend the arrangements made by this Body, we use the word *endeavour*, because it appears to us, from the tone adopted by the Bishop, that although he acquiesced in these measures, he is by no means thoroughly satisfied with them, and rather yielded to what he considered necessity; in other words, to what, during the period of the reform mania in this country, was regarded as the expression of popular opinion, but which, if persons had only permitted themselves to look forward a little, and had shaken off the culpable timidity and pernicious spirit of concession which unhappily distinguished that crisis, they would have viewed as nothing more than the outcry of a few discontented and seditious persons, who sought to accomplish their schemes of confusion and plunder, under the specious name of reform. Happily, people are grown somewhat wiser since then by experience, and can discriminate between the clamour of the traitorous demagogue and the calm and deliberate opinion of those who are really the people of England. The Bishop appears also to have been actuated, in giving his consent to one of the measures proposed by the ecclesiastical commission, that, namely, for abolishing some of the prebendal stalls, by a desire to increase the means of religious instruction in this country. The excellence of such an end no one can question, but the proposed means for its attainment, we must always unhesitatingly and strongly condemn. This deficiency ought to be supplied in a far different manner, in one indeed which the learned prelate has described so admirably in the conclusion of this part of his charge, that we cannot do better than extract it.

“ I shall not disguise my own opinion, that the deficiency of which we speak in the National Establishment, ought to be supplied at the national expence. I know it will be exclaimed, that the very notion is visionary and impracticable. Yet, such were not always the sentiments of Englishmen. It is within the memory of many of us, that, for eleven years, the annual sum of one hundred thousand pounds was granted by Parliament towards endowing and augmenting poor benefices in populous places; and had it not been for this grant, the Forest of Dean, as well as some other parts of our own diocese, instead of enjoying the pastoral ministrations of our Church for nearly twenty years, would have continued in a state little removed from heathenism. I must add, that this measure was first adopted at a time when the

public burthens pressed with a far heavier weight upon the community than they do at present ; when the nation was engaged in a fearful and perilous contest ; when the most gigantic power known in modern history was combined against our national independence under a mighty conqueror, whose talents and ambition are hardly paralleled among the children of men. Yet at that time, when the argument for economy was far more cogent than at present, and when party heats and animosities were as great as at any other period, I find that this grant was decreed with the marked and unanimous approbation of all parties in the House of Commons. This took place twenty-nine years ago ; our population has since increased by not less than five millions of souls. Let us then humbly pray that the God of mercy, whose arm wonderfully delivered this land from the dangers which beset it from without, and who worketh in the hearts of men ‘ both to will and to do of his good pleasure,’ may influence those now invested with the power, to make a similar grant from the vast and overflowing wealth with which He has blessed it, in order to spread the name and the religion of His Son among uninstructed multitudes.”

The Bishop then proceeds to notice the successful establishment of the Church Building Association in his own diocese. The contributions towards it appear to have exceeded in amount those raised by similar Associations in surrounding dioceses. And here his Lordship mentions one fact which it gives us the highest gratification to record. We give it in his own truly impressive language.

“ Out of fourteen thousand pounds, the amount of the contributions, some months ago, more than four thousand consisted of the personal donations of the clergy ; and the small incomes of many among the subscribers make it too certain that their sacrifice on the altar of Christian benevolence must have been seriously felt by the givers—seriously, but not painfully : they have shown that they can practise those virtues of self-denial and devotion to the cause of their blessed Master which they inculcate on their flocks, and that they at least are not unmindful of ‘ the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said—It is more blessed to give than to receive.’ ”

We come now to a very important part of the Bishop’s Charge, that, namely, which is devoted to the subject of education. In this the Bishop, as we believe, has been the first to make known to the public the new plan of national education, which has been framed by the Lord Primate as President of the National Society. This plan, it will be seen, has been so drawn up as completely to obviate all the objections which have been hitherto made by the advocates of a new system to that one practised by the National Society, namely, that it was not sufficiently extensive in its nature, and is at the same time calculated to satisfy the Churchman, as it is placed under the superintendence and

direction of the Clergy. For our own parts, we agree with the Bishop in thinking that the old system under which the Society has hitherto been conducted, was any thing but inefficient, but nevertheless the new plan is framed with such caution and regard to the interests of religion, that it is impossible to find any objection to its adoption. We extract for the information of our readers, the details of this plan as given by the Bishop, together with his prefatory observations.

“ I am not one of those who complain of the inefficient operations of the National Society ; on the contrary, I regard the good performed by that institution during the twenty-six years of its existence, as one of the most remarkable instances on record, of the extensive good produced by steady, zealous, and intelligent perseverance, on the part of charitable individuals in a well-organized system, and a well-directed course of action. The bare fact that it has aided in building many thousand school-rooms, and that above one million poor children (a fifteenth part of the whole population of England and Wales) are, through its agency, taught in connection with the Church, is a proof that its principles have been sound, and that the Divine blessing has rested upon its proceedings. But the means at its disposal are now nearly exhausted, and the annual revenue on which it can rely, is barely sufficient to maintain the expences of agency and correspondence, and of its central schools and training seminaries at Westminster. A new and extensive machinery is required, and the project of such an one I am now about to declare.

“ A negotiation has been for some months in progress between a Sub-Committee of the National Society, and several excellent and spirited members of our Church, who have propounded a project which has been adopted by the Society in all its leading features, and is in substance the following : It is designed to attempt the attainment of these objects :

“ 1. To provide a better class of teachers, by improving the education, condition, and prospects of schoolmasters.

“ 2. To ascertain and bring into notice improvements in the management of schools.

“ 3. To offer to the middle classes, on moderate terms, an useful general education, based on the religious principles of the Church.

“ To effect these purposes, a system is to be introduced into the several dioceses analogous to that provided by its Charter for the National Society itself. In each there is to be constituted one Diocesan Board of Management, consisting of the Dean, and other members of the Chapter, the Archdeacons, the Chancellor, the Lord-Lieutenant, the High Sheriff, the Mayor, the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, and a limited number of laymen, to be elected for life ; with an additional number of lay and clerical members, to be chosen in equal proportions by subscribers of a certain amount. This Board is to act under the presidency of the Bishop. Subordinate to this Body, it is proposed, that in each Rural Deanery, or other ecclesiastical division,

there shall be formed local Boards, upon similar principles, to superintend the interests of education within their districts. Connected with the Cathedral Body, and under the special authority of the Diocesan Board, it is designed that there shall be a central school, for the joint purpose of training schoolmasters and parish clerks for the diocese, and choristers for the Cathedral; it being a part of the plan that the elements of music shall be here taught, with a view to the general improvement of psalmody. In some leading town of each Rural Deanery, there is to be a commercial school, under the government of the District Board. The Committee of the National Society undertake to prepare a list of books of religious and moral instruction, to be revised and enlarged from time to time, with the sanction of its Episcopal members, for the use of schools in union with the Society. Such, I believe, are the main outlines of the new project. * * The project, however, is new, only bearing date on the first day of this month; and the present is, perhaps, its first public announcement. It will undoubtedly receive modifications adapting it to practice. The successful working of the machinery will obviously depend upon the cordial co-operation of the respective Deans and Chapters, as well as upon the approbation and assistance of influential laymen. I can only say that in the project, as far as I have been hitherto able to consider it, I perceive nothing but what is useful, practicable, and in the highest degree desirable. I earnestly hope, therefore, that it will receive encouragement in those quarters which can alone render it effective."

Heartily joining with his Lordship in his wishes for the success of this plan, we earnestly recommend our readers to lose no time in actively co-operating with it, and thus giving the most convincing proof to the world that they are determined that the people of England shall be trained up in the principles of her pure and Apostolic Church.

The Claims of our Colonies: a Sermon preached at the Meeting of the Marlborough Committees of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, on Friday, the 27th of July, 1838. By EDWARD, Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Salisbury: W. B. Brodie and Co. 8vo.

WE are very glad to find that the cause which we had the gratification of advocating in a former number, the increase, namely, of the means of religious instruction in our colonial possessions, has been so well and so zealously enforced by the Bishop of Salisbury. After speaking of the duty incumbent upon Christians in general of doing their part towards spreading abroad a knowledge of our most holy faith, his Lordship pro-

ceeds to speak of the particular obligation under which this nation stands, as the mistress of a vast and boundless empire, to publish amongst those colonies which are placed under her authority, and look up to her for protection, the glad tidings of the gospel of peace. The Bishop describes at some length the peculiar circumstances of our different colonial possessions; we wish we could extract the whole passage, but we must content ourselves with a portion only :—

“It has pleased the Almighty, in his inscrutable wisdom, to place this island which we inhabit, inconsiderable among the nations of the earth in its own extent, at the head of an empire the most widely spread that this world has ever seen, and equalling, in the number of those who obey its laws, the most populous kingdoms of the earth. North and south, at equal distances from either pole, are they of the same name and race as ourselves. East and west the sun never sets on those who own our sway and speak the accents of our tongue. What the psalmist applies to the heavenly bodies may almost be said of us—that there is no realm or clime where our voices are not heard—that their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world. Well were it, were those voices ever employed, as the silent teaching of the heavenly luminaries is, in declaring the glory of God, and showing forth his handy work! Well were it, did they endeavour to set forth that undefiled law of the Lord which converts the soul—that sure testimony which giveth wisdom to the simple—those right statutes which rejoice the heart—that pure commandment which giveth light unto the eyes. But if such is the position in which God has placed us, think ye that in this mighty prerogative of power no responsibility is implied? Think ye that the Almighty has thus confided to us the spiritual as well as the temporal interests of so large a part of his creatures, and will not require at our hands an account of how that trust has been discharged? May we not believe that in the counsels of his Providence our wide spread rule is designed to be a means, by which the blessings of redemption may be brought home to heathen lands, and His faith be established, and His name honoured among the nations of the earth! Let us then a little consider what is the peculiar situation in which we are placed in this respect—what are the advantages for the service of God which it offers—what are the imperative duties which it entails. In British America, England is mistress of a country, compared with which these islands are but a mere spot upon the face of the globe—a country of boundless range, where all is on a scale to astonish those accustomed only to the features of nature as presented to ourselves.....Not to speak of that interesting, though ill-fated race, the native inhabitants of this land, from whom we have wrested its dominion, but thousands of whom British subjects, although still strangers to the faith of Christ, wander in the woods which were once their own—not, I say, to speak of these, though we are debtors too to them, hundreds of thousands of our fellow countrymen are already inhabitants of these regions, and their

numbers are daily swelled, not only by the ordinary increase of population, but by the multitudes who are thronging by thousands from our own over-peopled land to those shores which lie open to receive them. The foundations of a mighty empire are indeed there. On us, haply, it depends that they be laid broad and deep in the knowledge of God, and in the faith and love of our Redeemer Christ—on us it depends to aid their spiritual destitution in these untrodden wilds, and, in their feeble and infant state, to care for them as brethren in the Lord. And this is a sphere of exertion which has ever been the peculiar care of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The very existence of our Church in these regions may be said, under Divine Providence, to be its work; and ever since has it struggled, through difficulties hard to be described, to enable the ministration of that Church to be supplied in a measure in some degree adequate to the demand. It is painful to reflect that this, which should be a nation's work, has been repudiated by the authorities of the nation, at the moment when the aid of the national funds was most needed: and that much of the difficulty under which this Society now labours arises from the withdrawal, by the Legislature, of a grant of 16,000*l.*, by which the nation used formerly rather to acknowledge the claims upon it than to discharge them."

We wish we could continue the picture which the Bishop draws of the nature of that vast colonial empire which Britain possesses, and of the consequent responsibilities attached to the possession of such a power; but we are compelled to stop, and must content ourselves with extracting the concluding paragraphs of the Sermon, earnestly hoping that they will have the effect of rousing the attention of the public to the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, so as to induce them to make up by their contributions that deficiency in its income which has been caused by the *very liberal* and *Christian-like economy* of the State:

"I have now set before you, most imperfectly, the general sphere of the duties which this our Society endeavours to discharge; and I cannot but feel assured, that its objects are those of which every one will admit the importance, while the vastness of their extent must clearly call for our best energies in our endeavours to attain them. Time will not now allow me to enter upon the question as to the mode in which this may best be done; and I will not think so ill of your Christian zeal as to endeavour, by exaggerated appeals, to draw from excited feelings what cooler judgment would withhold. 'Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart; not grudgingly, nor of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver.'"

I will rather ask you, with all cool consideration, to put to yourselves the question, whether, as Christian men, ye are doing your part in this labour of love? As men who have the necessaries, and some of the superfluities of life, are ye devoting any portion of your worldly means

to promote the spiritual and eternal interests of your fellow-men? Do ye contribute in any degree, however small, to that great work of Christian edification, which it is the object of the Church, by means of this Society, to carry on? It were easy, surely, to spare, and yearly to devote, some few shillings, at least, to this end. It were easy, surely, to collect small sums among yourselves, and to give them in, as a joint contribution, to the service of your Lord. It were easy to many of you, and should be pleasing, too, to enrol your names among those to whom the Society owes its support; and thus to contribute, according to your means, to the propagation of the Gospel in heathen lands, and the building up in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ our fellow-subjects in those wide-spread regions of the earth which it has pleased the Almighty to place beneath our rule."

A Funeral Sermon preached at the Old Church, Calcutta, on the Decease of Baboo Mohesh Chunder Ghose. By the Rev. KRISHNA MOHANA BANERJEE. 12mo. Calcutta: Bishop's College Press, 1837. Chelmsford: re-printed by Chalk, Meggy, and Chalk. 1838.

A SERMON delivered in a pulpit of the Church of England by a Clergyman by birth a Hindoo, on the occasion of the death of another converted Hindoo, is not only a literary curiosity, but is interesting and important in the greatest degree on far higher grounds. It is a striking fulfilling of those promises recorded in Holy Writ, which tell us that the pure faith which our blessed Lord came on earth to publish to lost and fallen man, shall spread over the whole world. It is an unanswerable reply to that sneering question which has been so frequently asked by the scoffer and the lukewarm: "How shall the Indian cast off his superstitions and become a Christian?" It is one of the best proofs of the excellent effects which, through the blessing of God, have attended upon the efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and is at the same time one of the strongest arguments which can be brought forward to induce persons to enrol themselves amongst her members.

To witness so interesting an event as this, and one which we do not hesitate to pronounce as pregnant with the most important consequences to the religious welfare of the eastern world, we ourselves would not have hesitated to travel a very considerable distance, and we are sure that those Europeans who were present, if they were at all imbued with religious feeling, must have been deeply penetrated with a sense of the omnipotence and wisdom of the Almighty, and must have been ready to exclaim, in the fulness of their hearts, "With God all things are possible!"

The sermon before us would be creditable, as a composition, to any English writer; but considered with reference to the source from which it proceeds, can scarcely fail to excite feelings of surprise in those who peruse it. It is dedicated to the Archdeacon of Calcutta, and appears to have been published in consequence of his request. We extract one or two passages from it, that our readers may be enabled to judge of the style in which it is written :

“ The consolations which Christianity proposes to man in this world of sin and sorrow are very remarkable. It inspires the penitent sinner with hope, and it heals the wounds which the conscience receives from the conviction of guilt. ‘ It preaches good tidings unto the meek ; it binds up the broken-hearted ; it proclaims liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.’ In the midst of mental perturbation caused by sin, the Gospel becomes truly the *pearl of great price*. We are herein assured of the love wherewith God has loved us, and of the wonderful way opened for our salvation. While nature is silent on the great question concerning human redemption, Christianity assures us that God willeth not the death of a sinner, but is ready to receive those that come unto him by faith. While we are sinking down under the weight of our sins, the gracious invitation sounds as music in our ears—*Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*. God himself tells us, that if we turn unto him, believing in his Son Jesus Christ, though our sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow ; though they be red as crimson, they shall be as wool.’ The Son of Man came into the world ‘ to seek and to save that which was lost ; and no one that cometh unto Him will He in any wise cast out. These are gracious expressions, and calculated to call forth joy and gratitude. What thanks can we render unto God for the peace which he has granted unto us through the Gospel !” P. 7, 8.

Speaking of “ the authority on which we receive the momentous truths of Christianity,” our Author says :

“ First, then, with reference to the Divine Authority of our religion—it is comforting to reflect that we have the privilege of being directed by the Deity himself in our way to salvation. The Apostle writes not the momentous truth according to his own judgment, but he writes what ‘ a voice from heaven’ dictates. The mysteries of Christianity are all founded upon Divine testimony. We do not pretend to have received a knowledge of them by our own speculations ; and the infidel breaks through all the rules of propriety when he would have us measure the truth by our own weak and imperfect reason. Our faith stands upon a rock which cannot be shaken : we have the Word of God himself as our authority for the doctrines we profess. The Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists were all inspired penmen, and ‘ wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.’ We speak not things which human wisdom teaches, but which the Divine Wisdom

teaches. Blessed be God, that he has not left us to ourselves on points which concern our best interests. No doubts and uncertainties can disturb us ; no metaphysical subtleties can puzzle us ; no vain philosophy can weaken our faith. We believe in Divine things upon the Divine testimony, and we are sure we cannot be wrong. God can never deceive us, and no exception can be made to his testimony. He is all knowledge, and cannot therefore mislead us through ignorance. No mystery is a mystery to Him. ‘ The darkness hideth not from Him, but the night shineth as the day ; the darkness and the light are both alike to Him.’ ”

Travels in the Three Great Empires of Austria, Russia, and Turkey. By C. B. ELLIOTT, M.A. F.R.S. Vicar of Godalmin ; Author of “ Letters from the North of Europe.” 8vo. 2 vols. London : R. Bentley. 1838.

THIS is a very interesting work to the religious reader, as it contains some very curious information relative to the state of Christianity in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. The Author visited the Apocalyptic Churches, and has given a detailed account of their present condition. The reader is presented with many details respecting the doctrines entertained by the different sects of Christians in these countries, their relative numbers, political and social state, &c. It appears that the persecuting spirit of the Popish faith displays itself in Syria with as much violence as in Europe. Mr. Elliott gives an account of an individual, a member of the Romish persuasion, who, having become a convert to Protestantism, suffered the most cruel persecution during a period of six years, until death put an end to his sufferings. For a detailed account of this person’s history we refer the reader to the second volume. In the same volume Mr. Elliott has given a tabular view of the various persuasions, Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian entertained by the inhabitants of Syria, which we shall extract :

“ No fact connected with the moral state of this country is more remarkable than the variety of creeds professed. There probably is no portion of the world of equal size in which such a diversity of religionists are to be found as in Syria. The Mohammedans are divided into six sects ; the Jews into three, including the Samaritans, who ought more properly to be ranked as a distinct class ; and the Christians into twelve, as follows :

Mohammedans.—Sonnees, Sheeahs, or Mutuallis, Druses, Nizarees, Ismaelees.

Jews.—Rabbinists, or Talmudists, Karaites, Samaritans.

Christians.—Greeks, Greek Catholics, Armenians, Armenian Catholics, Jacobites or Syrian Christians, Jacobite Catholics, Copts, Copt

Catholics, Abyssinians, Maronites, Latins or Frank Roman Catholics, and Protestants.

We envy Mr. Elliott the opportunities which he enjoyed, and of which he certainly made the most use, in visiting those scenes and places consecrated to the Christian's eye by the presence of the Lord of Life and of his Apostles. In performing such a journey, the traveller must prepare himself to encounter difficulties and dangers of no slight degree, and in addition to these it appears that our Author suffered severely from illness brought on by fatigue and the noxious atmosphere of the country surrounding the Dead Sea. Every page of his work supplies additional proof of the truth of Holy Writ. "Indeed," as Mr. Elliott himself observes, "at every turn the Christian student meets with illustrations of the inspired writings. The expressions, parallels, and imagery of the Bible are peculiarly adapted to this Holy Land; and Syria may be regarded as a local commentary on the Sacred Volume." One circumstance, among others mentioned by Mr. Elliott, as throwing light on the Scriptures, affords so admirable an illustration of the narrative of the paralytic man in St. Mark's Gospel, that we must extract the passage. Speaking of the village of Zebedanee, he says:

"Here, as in all the Arab villages, the houses are built of bricks dried in the sun; and the roofs are composed of mud laid over branches of trees supported on long straight trunks of aspen. Each is furnished with a stone roller, as in the isle of Castel-Rosso, and rolled after heavy rain; without which precaution it falls in; nor is it uncommon to see half a village destroyed by a rainy season, while the loss of a roof is an event of ordinary occurrence. The houses are all of the same height, never exceeding one story, and their tops communicating with one another form a favourite promenade in dirty weather, as well as the sleeping-place of the men in summer. A knowledge of these facts and of the construction of Syrian dwellings throws light on the narrative of the paralytic, whose friends uncovered and broke up the roof of a house to let down his bed before our Lord. It was not unusual to place a sick man's couch on the roof; to open a hole in it was a simple operation; and to repair the damage was scarcely more difficult."—Vol. II., p. 278.

We recommend to our readers the whole of that portion of Mr. Elliott's work which describes Syria and the Holy Land. Some of his accounts are particularly graphic and vivid, amongst others, the narrative of the pilgrimage to the river Jordan is especially worthy of notice.

The Obligations of the National Church. A Charge delivered at the Visitation in Hampshire, September, 1838. By W. DEALTRY, D.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester. With an Appendix, consisting chiefly of Extracts from an Article in the Seventh Number of the New York Review, "On the State of the Church of England." 8vo. London: J. Hatchard and Son. 1838.

THERE is a fervent strain of piety, an eager desire to promote the spreading of the Christian faith in this charge, which can scarcely fail to impart a portion of the same spirit to the minds of its readers. It is chiefly occupied with considering the duty incumbent upon Churchmen of affording sufficient means of religious instruction not only to their own countrymen, but to the colonies also. In Dr. Dealtry's mode of treating this extensive and important subject, some most valuable hints are thrown out, as might be supposed, and some most interesting facts are mentioned, which merit deep consideration.

In Dr. Dealtry's observations on the subject of education which occur before he comes to the principal subject of his address, he mentions a plan proposed by the Bishops of London and Winchester "for the establishment and improvement of commercial schools in the Metropolis and its suburbs, in connexion with the National Church," which he gives at length in his Appendix: "a plan capable of being adapted to any locality where there is need of it, which appears to be well calculated for its object; while at the same time the Committee appointed by the National Society to revise the whole subject of education, holds forth the reasonable prospect of a judicious and effective system in every department of popular instruction."

Speaking of what has been done in the great and pious work of building additional Churches of late, Dr. Dealtry mentions some facts which we shall extract:

"To go into minute details on this subject is not in my power; but having, through the kindness of a few Right Reverend Prelates who occupy Sees of great extent and importance, received very recently some information as to these matters which appears to be interesting, I shall beg to lay it before you. To begin with this diocese. 'The building of new Churches within my diocese,' observes the Bishop of Winchester, 'is steadily advancing.' Since I delivered my charge in October, last year, not a few have been added to the number of them reported. Up to the 8th of September, the whole number consecrated by me within the last ten years, in this diocese, amounts to fifty-six. During the same period, between two and three hundred more have been enlarged or improved. And in token that the disposition to provide accommodation is not abated, I need only add,

that in addition to the above, twenty-seven other Churches are now in various stages of progress.' The Bishop of London, under the date of August 25th, writes thus:—' I am thankful for being able to say, that if I live over Monday next, I shall have consecrated eighty-four new Churches, twenty-seven of these in the diocese of Chester, and fifty-seven in the diocese of London ; five of these last have been built by means of the Metropolis Churches Fund, and arrangements have been made by us for the erection of twenty-one more ; besides which, five others are in progress in my diocese ; and if I should be spared to witness their completion, I shall have consecrated one hundred and ten new Churches ; but I reckon confidently on a large number being built in my diocese within the next few years, for the spirit is spreading. It is proper to state that, in the foregoing number, eight were building on an enlarged scale.' From the Bishop of Chester I have the following information:—' The number of Churches consecrated by me during the ten years of my episcopate is one hundred and three Churches ; Churches now building in the diocese thirty-five ; Chapels and Oratories, [not consecrated, but having their own ministers and congregations, twenty. The sum employed upon Churches during the last three years exceeds £150,000. I am happy to say that the spirit is not exhausted, and that I am constantly hearing of new designs.' The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol states—' The number of Churches which I have already consecrated is eight, six of which are large ones ; one only had been begun in the time of my predecessor. Six new Churches (all of considerable dimensions) are in the course of erection, and some almost ready for consecration. All these are in the ancient diocese of Gloucester. Schemes are in preparation for erecting seven or eight other Churches, to which grants have been already voted by our Diocesan Association. And I entertain sanguine hopes that many will ere long be taken in hand in Bristol and other populous places. The main obstacle which generally meets us, is the difficulty of procuring convenient sites at moderate expence. This last answer will satisfy you that the spirit of Church building is not upon the decline, but on the increase, amongst us.'

" These facts," says Dr. D., " are valuable, not merely as showing the improved tone and spirit of the times, but as proving whatever may be the activity of other classes of Christians, and whatever apprehensions may reasonably exist from the rapid growth of Roman Catholic Chapels, the Church of England has not been left behind in the general movement. We shall scarcely be chargeable with a rash conjecture, if we express the belief, that this additional accommodation, by the building of new Churches, and by the enlargement and better arrangement of old ones, greatly exceeds all that has been provided in the same time by the several denominations among us : and, if we omit the Wesleyan Methodists, would probably bear a considerable ratio to the provision hitherto made in all their places of worship. That Popery is on the increase in this country, is a proposition which is not meant here to be either affirmed or denied : such

increase, however, if it exist, is not necessarily to be inferred from the additional number of their new Chapels; for it is their practice to build where there are few Roman Catholics now, in the hope of a congregation hereafter. Our system has been lamentably the reverse. We but too often allow the want of a new Church to be most painfully felt before we think of erecting it; and even if we should measure the growth of Popery in relation to Protestantism and the National Church, by comparing their respective new places of worship, and suppose them all to be filled, we must not forget, while counting those of the Roman Catholics, that larger number which during the same period has been erected by ourselves.' Dr. Dealtry, further on, recapitulates the results of the spirit for building Churches, which, thanks be to God, has been excited of late amongst us.

"The population of England and Wales, according to the census of 1831, was, in round numbers, 14,000,000; the population of the four dioceses to which particular reference has been made, amounted, by the same census, to about 4,900,000. The number of benefices in England and Wales is about 10,500: the number in the dioceses adduced, exceeds 2,100. Is it no encouragement to find such a spirit as that which we have witnessed in the midst of so large a part of the population? Is it nothing to find that in these 2,100 benefices have been built, within a few years, or are now in progress—380 Churches and Chapels, being at the rate of a new place of worship for every sixth parish; while arrangements are contemplated for a large number besides? Do not these facts, even on the most superficial view of our means, encourage us to prosecute the work as one which we may carry forward to a far greater extent, both in building places of worship, and in providing for the ministers?"

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Ripon, at the Primary Visitation of the New Diocese, in July and August, 1838. By the Right Rev. CHARLES THOMAS, Lord Bishop of Ripon: 8vo. London: J. G. and F. Rivington. 1838.

THE Primary Charge of the Bishop of a newly erected Diocese is a publication which undoubtedly merits notice. The Charge before us also deserves it on many grounds. It is written throughout in a mild, courteous, and persuasive tone; although we could have wished that the Right Reverend Prelate had spoken out more decidedly in particular parts of his Address. His Lordship appears to be favourable to the Benefices Plurality Bill, and to have wished that the limitation had been more strict, so as to have confined the holding of livings in plurality to those benefices only which are contiguous. He was deterred, however, by the objection which was urged, that it would so much reduce the numbers of curates employed as to leave little opportunity of training the younger clergy, under the direction of more experienced ministers, and thus preparing

them for changes in which they would be left to their own unassisted discretion. For our own parts we are decidedly opposed to the Benefices Plurality Bill, and still more, of course to the very strict limitation to which it seems that the Bishop of Ripon would, under certain circumstances, have been favourable. It is all very well to talk of the necessity for each parish to have a resident Rector or Vicar; and, undoubtedly such a result would be very desirable; but as, unfortunately, very many livings in England are so small as not to be sufficient to provide a decent maintenance for the incumbent, we do not see how such a result is to be brought about, except at the cost of much discomfort and even distress. Such a result, however, it appears, is likely to be brought about in part; and, much as we approve of the residence of every incumbent upon his living (although it ought to be recollected that where this is not the case, there is always a resident curate, who is equally able to supply the spiritual wants of the parish), yet we cannot conceal from ourselves the consequences which are likely to ensue from the restrictions imposed in holding benefices in plurality. In many cases the incumbents of livings will either be obliged to live upon their private fortune, should they happen to possess one, or else they will gradually be depressed, in temporal matters, to a situation far below that which a minister of God should occupy. Clergymen must be fed, like other men; although some persons, by their mode of conversation, seem to think that they are to live upon air. We admire the strict and accurate scrutiny which is exercised upon all occasions into the incomes of the Clergy; those splendid pittances upon which a gentleman, his wife, and family are to be supported, and from which means it is expected that he is to contribute to every call of benevolence and charity. It is truly edifying to hear the purse-proud trader, who realizes his tens of thousands by exacting exorbitant profits upon every article which he sells, talking of the over-paid Clergy; particularly when it so happens that the Clergy are not paid out of the pockets of any one, but derive their revenues from endowments which never belonged to the public, and with which they have nothing to do.

The Bishop of Ripon has touched upon most of the topics connected with the Church, and some of them he has treated in a very able manner. We should point out the two important subjects of Catechizing and Confirmation more particularly. His Lordship's observations upon these are well entitled to perusal. We cordially sympathize in the concluding exhortation of the Bishop:

"I have, thus, my Rev. Brethren, touched upon a few of those

points which have chiefly attracted my attention since I came among you. It remains for me only to add a few words of hope and of prayer, that we may not have assembled together, upon this solemn occasion, without reaping that fruit from it which such meetings ought ever to produce among us. May we, each of us, in our respective stations, feel it to be a call to stir up the gift that is within us, and to go forth to the discharge of our several duties with renewed zeal and fresh devotion to the service of our dear Master. And to this end, let us persevere in *mutual* prayer, that our hands may be strengthened for the great work which He has committed to us: you, for your parts, entreating Him to endue your chief Pastor with the spirit of wisdom and of ghostly strength that he may in all things watch faithfully over the flock—may exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine—may administer discipline so as not to forget mercy, and be so merciful as not to be too remiss. While I would continually seek a blessing upon your ministerial labours that you yourselves may increase and go forward in the knowledge and faith of the Father, and of the Son, by the Holy Spirit; and that your Churches may be walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost. Thus may we all have our loins girded, and our lamps trimmed, and be like servants waiting for their Lord, that when he cometh, he may find us watching, and enabled to render an account with joy of the stewardship entrusted to us."

A Brief View of Ecclesiastical History,' from the Earliest Periods to the Present Time. Fourth Edition. Dublin: Curry. 1838.

THIS work contains a brief summary of the History of the Church, and is written professedly for the lower classes; but its usefulness is likely to benefit the higher also, and especially candidates for Holy Orders. It is a complete *multum in parvo*, and is particularly valuable in the present day, as showing, in a very clear point of view, how the truth has been preserved by a cloud of confessors and witnesses amid the heresies and schisms of past ages.

-
- I. *The Altar Service: for the use of Country Congregations: with short Prayers, adapted for the Communion of the Sick.* By the Rev. S. ISAACSON, A. M. pp. 128.
 - II. *Select Prayers, for all Sorts and Conditions of Men: with Devotional Exercises for the Friends of the Sick; and calculated to assist Young Ministers in their Official Visitation.* By the same Author, pp. 128. London. T. Tegg, Simpkin and Marshall, and J. Hearne.

IN no department of Divinity has so little been effected as in the publication of Companions to the Altar; the *New Com-*

panion, as it is called, being considerably more than a century old; and the *new* editions being only reprinted with *new* title-pages. On this subject complaints have frequently and justly been made, and we therefore are most happy to introduce Mr. Isaacson's really *new* work to our readers. The exhortation is a masterly composition, and we are given to understand the Author has been requested by influential persons to republish it in a cheap form, as being admirably calculated to explain the doctrines of the Established Church on the subject of the Sacrament, and to obviate the doubts and fears by which the sincere and lowly believer is but too frequently deterred from communicating. The prayers and ejaculations during the service are at once appropriate and affecting. But the great novel feature is the communion of the sick, and the excellent preparatory visitation service, which cannot fail to be highly acceptable to the young divine. The "select prayers" are no less deserving our approbation; and bound together, we do not think *a new year's gift* would be found more suitable and valuable. They have our most cordial approbation, and we have no doubt will become standard works throughout the country. The *Altar Service*, especially, cannot fail to be the COMPANION of every communicant wherever the Protestant Episcopal Church is recognized.

Ecclesiastical Report.

THE consequences of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill become every day more serious, and hurry onwards to fresh outrages with a fearful rapidity. Scarcely a paper is issued by the public press which does not, in one way or another, certify us of the impolicy of the measure, and convince us that, under the popular plea of Emancipation, Supremacy was intended. On the one side we see the Dissenters merging their religious principles in a confederacy with the Papists against the Church; on the other, the agents of a most ramified plan at work all over the empire, insiduously, as well as openly, to sink our Establishment to the very verge of extinction; and let loose an omnigenous pack of spiritual demagogues on the public, until the pre-eminence of one party in the motley groupe shall think fit to subdue, *convert*, or exterminate the others. Monasteries and Popish churches arise around us; where God is not

addressed *directly* and *immediately*, as with us, but *indirectly* and *mediately*, through the Virgin Mary and pseudo-Saints: and by music, mummary, and *spectacle*, the people are led astray from the pure worship of God, and induced to lapse into idolatry. Nor stops the encroachment here; for it is planned to erect in the Metropolis a Cathedral of greater dimensions than St. Paul's, to which *one hundred thousand pounds are ready to be subscribed by members of the Legislature!* in which Popery will be exhibited in all its splendour, and, of course, become more dangerous from its increased allurements. In our own body, also, vigorous attempts are made to erect such a system which, it requires no foresight to perceive, will itself end in Popery.

On this, and on many other points, the Conservative Press, and especially *The Times*, has very properly sounded the alarm; and we would impress on the Clergy that these are not the times in which they should be at issue about any minor differences of opinions; but times in which all of them who are averse to Popery, and to the fast-prevailing notions which are promulgated by some members of the University of Oxford, should combine their consolidated strength to urge the rulers of the Church to vigorously counteracting measures to induce the members of the congregation to exert their power, as they hesitated not to exert it in the case of Dr. Hampden, when Dr. Pusey arrayed himself against him! Or, in default of such an exertion of power on the part of the University, to perform their remaining duty, and apprise those committed to their charge of the danger which the rising generation may be expected to incur, if pupils for the ministry and senate be sent to that University. Many see the collecting cloud of mischief, yet none take the proper means of dispersing it. We trust that the Public Press will take the hint, and follow it into detail.

The Rev. Mr. Ellis has lately addressed some very good remarks to the Irish Protestant Peasantry Society, in which he has pointed out the defects of preceding attempts to encourage Protestantism in Ireland, and suggested a plan which appears likely to be successful. The Government plans for National Education, which either totally exclude the Scriptures, or in one case tolerates the Scriptures, to the exclusion of all forms of faith, placing the tuition of the nation under a Commission or Board, may be enumerated among the dark projects which threaten to overcloud the religion of the country; the evil of which the Clergy, in their pastoral duties, should seek also to correct. The great number of new Churches which have been built, and are in process of erection, both in London and in the

counties, on the other hand, gives, and will give to us a counter-acting power, if we neglect not to avail ourselves of it.

The immense increase of population, the force of which is wholly incalculable, as "in a few years the multitude must have every thing at their mercy, by the mere weight of numbers," the facilities of communication both by sea and by land, by which the ends of the mightiest countries are brought together, the inevitable results of which must be the fusion of nations into one mass, waiting only light and air to ferment and throw out flame, and the attention of the legislation, for the first time on record, to the humbler orders (as Dr. Croly says), are all signs that the present state of things is not intended to last long. If this mass be left destitute of sacred instruction, or if they reject it, the catastrophe will be indescribable; yet in the Church of England Dr. Croly sees a repellent of the evil capable, by means of the national influence, of extension over the earth; and pursuing this view, shows, that schism and superstition are the natural enemies of the Church. In allusion to the conciliatory weakness of Parliament, he asks, "whom has the conciliation conciliated? Has either been content to extinguish the loud discord, and beat the sword into the ploughshare? Or has not the sword been flung into the scale, with the contempt of an acknowledged victor, in the very act of treaty? Both have declared in the plainest language, that the Church of England must be destroyed; our Bishops must be expelled from the legislature; that our Churches must be no longer upheld by the nation; and that our Clergy must be driven to the state for subsistence. *Delenda est Carthago!*"

Such is the language of all their public documents, of all their assemblages; and whilst thus we have been commanded to surrender at discretion, the exactions have opened the eyes of the public. The Marriage and Registration Bills, the public have, in a Christian spirit, made waste. The attempt to confiscate the oldest property in the realm, under the voluntary principle,—“that bill of indemnity for every meanness and every fraud of man,” and the conspiracy of religionists hurrying from the extremes of opinion to amity, that they may merge their antipathies in sacrilege, have been viewed and will be viewed with all the disgust and abhorrence, and strenuously opposed. Twice through schism of superstition, within less than two centuries, has England been brought to the verge of ruin;—no sober man will provoke the third hazard.

Dr. Croly has forcibly proved, that Popery is the chief evil against which we should guard ourselves. Notwithstanding the

futile experiment of pacification, the Popish Bishops who solemnly pledge themselves to respect the rights of the Established Church, and not interfere with the Protestant Prelacy, have assumed the Popish titles as a preliminary to the assumption of their offices, their parliamentary friends have never ceased from aggressions on us, and rapine and blood have desolated Ireland. Dr. Croly fears not Dissent, because it wants the three great principles of Ecclesiastical permanency—a fixed creed—a fixed discipline—a fixed revenue: but these Popery has. Let us again recommend Dr. Croly's Visitation sermon to every true Churchman.

THE PROPOSED GENERAL UNION OF DISSENTERS FOR THE
PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS EQUALITY.

TRULY, this is a queer project to write. *Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum.* From the Calvinist to the Arminian, the Independent to the Southcotonian, Ranter, and all the *myrionymous* distinctions—the trumpet is sounded to attack the Church! As the Dissenters have a perfect toleration and labour under no civil disadvantages, the equality which they pretend to seek, is in reality pre-eminence, temporal and ecclesiastical power—in one word, a *pious* scramble after our loaves and fishes. What boots it, if such a scramble can only be affected by direct robbery!—they will *ask no question for conscience sake.*

The Dissenters have long exhibited their hostility to us; but never, till now completely discarded the mask. We have long seen the objects concealed by their affectation of superior sanctity—they have now permitted the public at large to see it. How far a Government can be justified in listening to the conceited pretensions of men so imperfectly educated as the Dissenting preachers are, is a question too obvious to demand an elaborate reply; and how far they are entitled to any claim to the ministry, is a theological question. At all events their appetency of power is directly contrary to the Christian principles which they profess. Their first resolution must depend on the mode of interpreting the Scriptures; and unless they can prove that they correctly interpret them, their reasoning fail; and the third completely shows that it is secular authority at which they aspire. In this, however, we observe the extraordinary term *social discord*, which we cannot comprehend.

In this paper an organized system is developed: a central committee with its local branches and funds—a projected interference with the Legislature—an arrogant contemplated dicta-

tion* to Members of Parliament—a tender of legal advice and aid to individuals, very much like Barratry, and an intermeddling with the return of Representatives to the House of Commons, are unblushingly proposed ! The opposition of this union to the Church is plainly stated in the address ; and its impellant cause is the heresy at Oxford. If any body of men had joined in a confederacy to avert the mischief, which the Oxonian triumvirate and partisans, if unchecked, must effect, they would have deserved well of all men ; but when, on account of this, they take occasion generally to assail the Church, and seek political influence, they manifest a bitterness and worldly-mindedness which cannot co-exist with *pure* religion. The Church should therefore rally her friends around her—she should stop the schism in her body, or extrude the schismatics from her pale : —then may she defy the dastard and unprincipled designs of her foes.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BATH.

It gives us great pleasure to announce to our readers that a New College is to be erected at Bath, in connexion with our Universities. It deserves the countenance and assistance of every individual who is able to give them. Its object is to receive and instruct young men, either during the vacations, or to ground them for Oxford or Cambridge ; or to prepare them for Ordination ; or to educate them, should they not be intended for the Church, in the pure principles of Protestantism, as set forth in the Articles and Homilies of the Established Church, and every branch of literature and science on the lowest terms. This, indeed, is a noble project, and we wish it every possible success. Bath is setting our Metropolis a glorious example. Its Church of England Lay Association is worthy of all commendation, and must produce the most prosperous result in that city and neighbourhood.*

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

WE have before alluded to the intention of the Roman Catholics to erect a magnificent Cathedral in London, and of one hundred wealthy peers and commoners subscribing £1,000.

* Where employment is devised for the Law, we are sure to find one or more lawyers present, in anticipation of Harpy-like occupation. As the name of Isaac Sewell stands on this Provisional Committee ; the 5th clause of the General Objects must have been peculiarly gratifying to him.

* A Prospectus of Queen's College may be had at Messrs. Rivington's, London, through any Bookseller in the Kingdom.

each towards it ! This report, together with the subjoined table which we have added, and for which we are indebted to the Roman Catholic Directory for 1839, ought to arouse Protestants from the coldness and indifference into which they have lately fallen.

ENGLAND.

Districts.	Priests.	Chapels.	Colleges.	Convents	Charity Schools.	Charitable Institutions.
London *	108	... 72	... 1	... 3	... 38	... 7
Midland †	124	.. 123	... 2	... 5	0	... 9
Northern ‡	231	... 194	... 3	... 4	0	... 0
Western	73	... 57	... 3	... 4	0	... 0
Total	336	446§	9	16	38	16

In Scotland there are 67 Roman Catholic Chapels, 1 College, and 74 Priests.

Thus in England and Scotland there are 610 Roman Catholic Priests and 513 Chapels.

In Ireland there are 2,022 Roman Catholic Priests, including their assistants.

THE UNITED STATES.

Priests in mission ...	334
Priests otherwise employed ...	88
Total ...	422

Chapels ...	324	Colleges ...	15
Other Stations ...	223	Female Institutions	27
Seminaries ...	11	Female Academies ...	38
Students ...	148	Charitable Institutions	39

THE WORKING OF THE NEW POOR LAW.

During the few weeks which were allowed us for relaxation in the last quarter, we had several opportunities of making inquiries in the country relative to the *working of the New Poor Law*. What appeared to be satisfactory answers were at first given to our inquiries; but when we had made further examination, we found that there was more of the *Old* law in operation than the New. The whole management of the Poor was confided to a set of Guardians, many of whom had never read the iniquitous Bill, and all of whom had not hearts hard enough to put those

* In this, distinct chapels are being built at Derby and Cossey.

† In this, district chapels are being built at Halifax, Evingham, Selby, Manchester, Oldham, Wycliffe, Bellingham, Keighley, Sytham, Preston, Staley Bridge, Cheshire, and Skipton, in Yorkshire.

‡ In this, district chapels are being built at Clifton and at Chipping Sodbury.

§ To this number may be added two or three hundred *stations* in which the Roman Catholic worship is performed.

clauses which they had learned by hearsay into operation. Contrary to the Act, out-door relief was invariably given; yet they declared that the New Bill worked well. Truly it worked well, so far as it allowed the Guardians to exercise their humanity to their fellow-creatures, but how would it have worked, had they strictly adhered to the Act? In six months it would have caused a revolution in the country.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

From the annual report of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, just issued, it appears that 95,649 Bibles, 87,496 Testaments, 191,723 Prayer Books, 10,069 Psalters, 145,479 bound books, 2,222,652 Tracts, have been sold this year; making a total circulation of Scriptural publications of 2,753,608. The income of the year amounts to only 83,163*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.*, while the expenditure is stated at 85,140*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.* The number of Schools in connexion with the Society is 6,068 Sunday-schools, containing 438,280 scholars; 10,152 Sunday and day-Schools, in which are 514,450 scholars: and 704 Infant Schools, containing 43,730 scholars. Total Schools, 16,224; and total number of Scholars 996,460.

ON THE LAW OF LIBEL.

It cannot be denied, that in the complicated body of our laws there are some which press unequally, some which by the investment of power in the one party, to the exclusion of the other from an equal exertion of it become liable to abuse from unprincipled persons, to whom an oath is a mere legal requisition, divested of all sanctity, and thus are positively unjust. We are far from affirming that the legislation, at the time of legislating should be expected to foresee all possible contingencies; but we have a right to exact, that contingencies which are not only probable, but obvious, and must operate evil, should be precluded by the stringency of Parliamentary enactments. We also have a right to demand, that when any law shall have been found incompetent to the purposes of justice, on account of the various interpretations of which it may be susceptible, and of its inadequacy to preserve the balance of power between litigating parties in seeking open and unprejudiced decisions, it either should be entirely repealed, or its errors in principle should be immediately rectified. But as, according to the trite proverb, what is every parliamentary man's business becomes no man's business, and thus abuses continue in full operation even during the increase of civilization and intellectuality: the Chancellor in the Lords, the Attorney-General in

the Commons, should have the task of bringing all such defects in our Legal Code before the Senate imposed on their respective offices.

We would particularize the Law of Libel as being so circumstanced; and we are well assured, that the circumstances under which it is placed operate against the prevention of Libel. *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit*, is falsified by its operation. A vexatious power is given to him who will make oath that he is the subject of a libel, whilst the right of proving the *truth* of the allegations, which are professed to constitute the libel, by means of subpoenaed witnesses, is injuriously taken away from the defendants. Thus may a malicious or revengeful person twist and torture passages, which have a totally distinct reference, to his object, and giving plausible reasons in his affidavit and the counts of the indictment, succeed, by the help of an oily-tongued advocate, in persuading a jury that he has established his case. Thus too may fraud and all various wrong prevail, unintimidated by the public press; for the exposure of it, in the present state of the law, is libellous; thus too is a door of iniquity opened to the ruined profligate to procure finances by damages. Nay, we ourselves scarcely know, whether by some wire-drawn sophism, we, as Reviewers, in our just criticism of works, may not continually be exposed to the charge of libels; for the case stands precisely with us as with the public press; we censure and pull to pieces the character of works, in which are included necessarily the characters of the authors, as scholars and reasoners: we say not, that any one so censured would attempt to enforce the law of libel against us—but we affirm, that the law will as much favour such an attempt, as it has already favoured the application of its provisions to the remarks of *The Times* in a recent case.

Three modes of operation are presented to the choice of the person libelled: a civil action, a criminal information, or an indictment. The first enables the defendant to compel the attendance of witnesses, and thus empowers a jury to decide on the truth or falsehood of the assumed libel; it is therefore the process which every one who wishes to justify his character would adopt. But though the process by criminal information may comprehend the question of truth or falsehood, if it be vigorously pursued, it is not co-extensive in efficacy with that by civil action; for the defendant has not the privilege of enforcing the attendance of witnesses. The criminal information indeed can only be obtained by the plaintiff's oath, that the allegations against him are false; and although it may be refused, if the defendant can by an affidavit convince the Court that they

are true, there may be a difficulty, and often is one, in convincing the Court, in this state of the business; and should the persons, by whose testimony the defendant attempts to support his charge, be in the interest of the plaintiff, he has no remedy and no power of substantiating his words. No opportunity is given to his advocate of submitting the witnesses to an interrogatory process, of eliciting the truth by a cross-examination, and bringing fairly before a Jury the grounds of the alleged libel; but a verdict, contrary to every principle of justice and sound jurisprudence, must be legally given against the defendant. Thus virtually an inquiry into the truth is impeded, and the falsehood of the charge is not satisfactorily established; damages indeed are awarded, perhaps incarceration, but the character is not vindicated from aspersion. The person who resorts to this mode of seeking redress, appears, in the eye of the Public, as one who shrinks from searching investigation,—one, probably, to whom malevolence has been the chief inducement to action; for it is plain, that every honourable man, who felt himself unjustly calumniated, would bring forward proofs of the wantonness and baseless nature of the calumny, and not only produce witnesses and allow adverse witnesses to be produced, but boldly offer himself to the ordeal of the witness-box. No other mode of action can be consistent with the feelings of a Gentleman, or with the free course of Justice:—*fiat justitia, ruat cœlum*. Can there be anything more preposterous, anything more contrary to equity, than for a trial to take place, and a verdict to be recorded in a case, in which the main point at issue—the truth or the falsehood—is not tried at all? Can there be anything more insulting to common sense, than for a person to affect anxiety to clear his character from slanderous imputations by a legal process, who resorts to one which does not clear it, but exposes it to the suspicion of being incapable of enduring scrutiny? The legal object is as bad as the process itself: it is not to clear the soiled character, to repair the injured reputation, it is not to investigate the correctness or the incorrectness of the charge, and award impartial justice: but it is to punish a breach of the peace, to chastise libel as a misdemeanour, the higher considerations being altogether excluded. The charge by affidavit, on which the criminal information is founded, and the refutation by affidavit, on which it may be refused, amount to nothing; for the continual experience which we have, that there are those who will not shrink from perjury, often difficult of detection, to achieve their ends, shews, that this is no safe precaution, and that it is one infinitely below the dignity of rational laws. In fact, it holds out a temptation to the unprincipled.

In the cases of sworn charges and sworn refutations, there must be perjury on one side; but the Court enters not into that question, though the contradictory affidavits must afford manifest evidence, that the laws relating to perjury have been violated by one of the parties; nor even if the case should proceed to trial, does the perjury form a part of the question. There is, however, by far too much of the

Hoc volo, sic jubeo : sil pro ratione voluntas,

in the whole affair; for there is no common sense, there is no sound fundamental principle; on the contrary, all is arbitrary, and unworthy of an enlightened nation. Whilst it is easy to obtain the rule *Nisi* on the plaintiff's affidavit, it is most difficult to prevent it from being rendered absolute by any counter statement on affidavit which the defendant may make; to the aggrieved the law proffers its succour; to the aggressor pleading in justification it is almost deaf.

In the case of indictment for libel, the deficiency of justice and wisdom is the same; the *ex-parte* statement of the prosecutor is the source from whence conviction proceeds; and unless he thinks proper to offer himself to the questions of the Bar, the law will not force him to do so. But the *gravamen* of the injustice is, that whilst the law scruples not to award heavy damages without regard to truth or falsehood, should the prosecutor submit to be questioned, and give evidently false testimony, that false testimony, which no legal quibble can separate *in foro conscientiae* from perjury, is not indictable, unless it be *material* to the *issue*; so that the religious and moral points are forced to give place to a debased expediency! It is, however, satisfactory to be assured, that the decision of a court of law, under these unequal circumstances, is not the decision of rightly thinking men; therefore, that the person thus seeking vindication as a *poltroon*, is not vindicated nor acquitted by the community. It is nevertheless clear, that when the rule has been made absolute, it is tantamount to a conviction, and that the only remaining question is the degree of punishment, yet, in the case of proprietors of newspapers, the injustice is still more flagrant, as they are required to furnish, *on oath*, EVIDENCE AGAINST THEMSELVES.

Some time past, *ex-officio* information was not uncommon; it was too odious to be tolerated long, and glided away from practice as foully and detestably as the Star Chamber. We hope that the time is not distant in which a similar fate will make the other varieties of process equally dead; in which all mockeries of justice will cease. It may readily be believed,

that the press is the only power which coerces many who are possessed of golden opportunities—that it is the only power which restrains some in high situations from violating the trust which is reposed in them, and that in still more private life the fear of its lash and exposure continually produces good, by confining within decent boundaries men, whose principles would lead them to no nice distinction between right and wrong: is it, therefore, just, that whilst these salutary and beneficial effects result from its fearless impartiality, from its castigation of the wrong and its eulogy of the right; whilst thus it strengthens the barrier of public opinion, by which the public good is preserved, by which virtue is extolled, and vice consigned to obloquy, it should itself be unprotected by the laws, nor even be permitted to vindicate itself, to give evidence of its truth, and more firmly fasten its charge on the offender? It is a plague-spot on our jurisprudence, that the censors of public morals should be exposed to malicious prosecutions; without the liberty of self-vindication, that what the one party—the party itself charged with the offence, shall think proper to affirm, shall be accepted as substantial verity, and, secured by the protection of the law, be allowed to gorge itself with the foul gluttony of its revenge.

Nay, as we have hinted, may not this partial principle be extended to our Periodical Literature in general; and to private works? May not criticism itself come under this obnoxious enactment? If we charge Titius (to use a name in the civil law) with writing, like an ass, and by our verdict stop the sale of his book, are we, on that account, to be liable to a civil action, a criminal information, or an indictment? Yet we see no essential difference between such an act and that for which the proprietors of *The Times* have been prosecuted. If we pledged ourselves at the commencement of our Review to give just critiques according to our ability; and, if we have given them, we have acted in our recognized department; but to what law are we justly amenable for having so acted? So if the proprietors of a newspaper pledged themselves to notice public delinquencies, impositions on the national funds, and all political chicanery, and redeemed their pledge, it is more than hard, it is demonstrably unfair; that a prosecution, without the means of defence, should be tolerated by the country. Ere such could have a foundation, it should be enacted on the one hand, that no work should be submitted to censure; on the other, that no villany, public or private, should be exposed; the infraction of which enactment would naturally lead to such consequences as those on which we are commenting. But what would be the tendency of such a law. What its operation? Would not irre-

ligion, immorality, folly, treason, peculation, and all that is vile be left without restraint? Would not the whole mass be leavened by impiety and anarchy. Yet, ere we can produce a fundamental reason for the existing law of libel, we must have, as a basis, some such an one as the preceding conjectural one, which is absurd, and contrary to every principle of sound legislation and good government:—how much more absurd, how much more contrary to sound legislation and good government, then, is the law itself, which has no basis except that of a misdemeanour, which is not even permitted to be proved?

Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi

The Attorney-General, in the late trial, expressed himself very correctly and boldly; and we hope, that it will be one of his Parliamentary duties to cause the monstrous evils of the present system to be destroyed by a repeal of the laws which authorise them. With Lord Denman, compared as the Judge and the Advocate, we are far from being satisfied. And we fearlessly say, that not one iota of the public opinion has been shaken by the decision of himself and the jury. It is evident, that in such a case as that which the Attorney-General cited, the investigation of the truth would be *summa injuria*; but the case of Sir John Conroy had no affinity to it. Cases of the two descriptions are very distinct from each other, and might easily be separated in the provisions which would constitute parts of the law; and the characteristics are too strongly marked to render a recognition of the two classes difficult. The law of libel might therefore be framed on a principle which might be generally equitable, and in no instance individually injurious; and it is clear, that the exposure which the investigation of the truth, by cross-examination, would elicit, would be the most effectual prevention against the wantonness of libel which the Legislature could devise; for people would not give cause for it. At the same time, the punishment which would attend a deviation from the truth, would be a salutary restraint upon authors, whether journalists or others; and thus the evil which is now duplicated by the existing law of injustice, would, by the force of steady justice, cure itself.

If we, however, consider libel in the light of a misdemeanour, than which, by the bye, we can hardly be required to assent to a greater absurdity, it still should be permitted to the person so misdeeming himself to explain and defend his motives, and bring the charge against him to the test, whether or not it be a misdemeanour. Yet, even under this curious classification of the offence, an examination of the grounds of classification is

not conceded; but, on the *ex-parte* statement, by oath, of the party affected, what should be proved, is in a great degree assumed. For if a paragraph be proposed to a jury as a libel on a person or persons, which perchance may bear a different interpretation, and has only the suspicious appearance of application to the complainant or complainants—a case which may very possibly occur: and if the author be not permitted to explain it and its real allusion, but the suspicion be accepted as an actual fact, no argument is required to shew, that the law in this respect is fraught with the grossest injustice. In every such instance, the misdemeanour is in the law itself.

Thus, in whatever way we may consider the legal practice respecting libel, it is injurious and inconsistent with equity, and requires an immediate correction.

PROGRESS OF POPEY.

At the late great Protestant meeting, held at the Horns Tavern, Lambeth, the following printed statement of the progress of Popery was distributed:—"Popery has been advancing, not only in wealth and influence, honour, and power, but it has been progressing in every direction, and by every means. At Court, where the required work cannot be efficaciously performed by deputy, we find that Roman Catholics appear in person. The Treasurer of the Household is a Roman Catholic; the Marchioness Wellesley, Lady Bedingfield, and the Earl of Fingall, all of whom have been about the Court for some time, are Roman Catholics; and several others of the same kind have been placed in minor situations. Many high offices in the State are now held either by Roman Catholics, or pseudo-Protestants. In Ireland almost every legal situation which has fallen vacant during the existence of the present Government has been given to a Roman Catholic! As instances, we may mention that the Master of the Rolls, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, the Chief Remembrancer, the Clerk of the Hanaper Office, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General, the Lord-Lieutenant's confidential legal advisers, are all Papists! In the colonies, the same system of mal-administration prevails. The newly-appointed Governor of New South Wales is Sir Maurice O'Connell, whose very name speaks volumes. In 1792, there were not in the whole of Great Britain 30 Roman Catholic Chapels, there are now 519, and 43 building. In that year, there was not one single Roman Catholic College, there are now 10, and 60 seminaries of education, besides chapel schools. In fact, in every part of the world Popery is pursuing its triumphant course, trampling on the consciences of mankind."

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

APRIL, MDCCCXXXIX.

Art. I.—*Tracts for the Times.* By Members of the University of Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

No. II.

“Can you point to *any* period of Church history in which doctrine remained for any time uncorrupted? Three hundred years is a long time. Are you quite sure we do not need A SECOND REFORMATION?”—*Tracts*, No. 38, p. 2.

IN our former article we have already developed the Papistical tendency of the Oxford Tracts: what we have there written, an examination of the Tracts will confirm. The objections to Romanism in these Tracts, are on the one hand so mild, and the passages which prominently notice the imposing nature of its services are so bold and unqualified on the other, that it is impossible to divest our minds from the suspicion, that the writers are covertly advocating the introduction of Popery into the Church. We cannot avoid recalling to memory a striking passage in an old work by Robert Wake, entitled *Foxes and Firebrands*, in which the following injunction to the Jesuits occurs:—

“Ye are not to preach all after one method, but to observe the place wherein you come. If Lutheranism be prevalent, then preach Calvinism: if Calvinism, then Lutheranism: *if in England, either of these, or John Huss's opinions, Anabaptism, or any that are contrary to the Holy See of St. Peter, BY WHICH YOUR FUNCTION WILL NOT BE SUSPECTED, AND YET YOU MAY STILL ACT ON THE INTEREST OF THE MOTHER-CHURCH: there being, as the Council are agreed on, no better way to demolish that Church of heresy, but by mixtures of doctrines, and BY ADDING OF CEREMONIES MORE THAN BE*

AT PRESENT PERMITTED. *Some of you, who undertake to be of this sort of heretical episcopal society, BRING IT AS NEAR TO THE MOTHER-CHURCH AS YOU CAN.....You are further (during the time you take these things upon you) to observe thus much of the rules of the Mother-Church: the Mother-Church disowneth the regal power to be her superior.You must bemoan your followers and auditors, saying.....we be more zealous against the Pope than they: and yet we be persecuted. By these means your contrivances will light on those ye lead along, AND NOT ON YOURSELVES.....These instructions I am commanded to recommend unto you, as being approved by his Holiness Julius the Third, your supreme father, and his wholesome Council, to be handled and performed to the utmost of your powers, wealth, parts, learning, and capacities, for the good of the Mother-Church. Dated the fourth ide of November, 1551. BENEVENTUM."*

This extract, in all its parts, is directly applicable to the Oxonian party: their extraordinary conduct makes it a luminous commentary on the suspicions which we are compelled by them to entertain; the Jesuitism of their Tracts is exactly the Jesuitism here recommended by Papal authority. Whether Dr. Pusey, during his residence abroad, became infected with Popish notions, we have no authority to decide; but it is very plain that he is precisely making the schism in our Church which Jesuitical policy enjoins; and that, conformably to it, whilst he is animadverting on some of the errors of the Romanists, he is extolling their general system. The proselytizing attempts of this confederacy, which is increasing all over the kingdom, and subverting every fundamental principle of the Reformation, which insolently arrogates to itself a power that belongs to no private individuals, and appeals, as authorities, to writers whose weak judgments and easy credence show them to be no authorities for the innovations which are daringly proposed to be made on our liturgical system, have been tolerated by the heads of our Church in a manner as surprising as it is culpable; and would, doubtless, be permitted to be carried into more open practice, if the terror of the public press were not a salutary check on the treason.

The question is scarcely whether the Fathers of the Ancient Church, correctly or incorrectly, have handed down to us primitive forms of worship: it is whether a Church, such as the Church of England, has a right to institute her own forms and ceremonies: it is whether those who have sworn to maintain those forms and ceremonies can innovate on them, or suggest innovations on them, without positive perjury? And when we trace these insidious attacks on all that we have accounted holy and venerable to one of our Universities—to principal men, some of them Professors in that University—the spirit that is directed against our religious customs, the spirit that has selected

the time for sapping the foundations *within*, whilst the Popish and Nonconforming foe is undermining them *without*, assumes a more frightful character, and increases the culpability of those who, having the power to stop the evil, apathetically, indolently, and unworthily treat it as an inconsequential circumstance. As *The Times* of the 4th of January observes—

“If they are of opinion, as positively affirmed by themselves, that our noble Church is too *Protestant* for their conscientious convictions, let them show their conscientiousness by resigning the emoluments which they employ for her disparagement; and let them openly join the Romish confederacy at once, in favour of whose claims to genuine Christian Catholicism they are labouring with might and main in the very heart of the Protestant garrison.” “Let them not (as the same paper adds) continue to devour and desecrate the *showbread* of England’s Church.”

Those who assert that the Church can *unchangeably* determine the true meaning of Scripture, and coerce the right of private judgment in ascertaining the sense of the Scriptural writers, have only to ascend a little further to assert the Popish doctrine of infallibility, to which one writer of this school has a very strong inclination: but if this doctrine be forced upon us, the way will be opened to every other monstrous fiction of the Romish faith. The authoritative claim of any Church to be the necessarily correct interpreter of sacred writ is an assumption of infallibility: it is one thing to propose an interpretation of it, but another to forcibly coerce the private judgment, and insist that its members should receive no other interpretation than that which it proposes. For instance, our increased acquaintance with the allusions of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Testament, our improved knowledge of ancient manners and customs, beyond those possessed in the time of the reformers, are evidence that no such a standard can be erected.

We do not perceive infallibility openly asserted in the Tracts, but unless we exceedingly misjudge their object, they are pioneering the way to the assertion of it; and Froude’s words, quoted in our preceding number, as the words of one of the writers, justify our opinion. The notion that infallibility is necessary to a Church, or that it is possessed by any Church, is not more absurd than profane; it is nothing less than the investiture of erring man with the perfect and inalienable prerogative of God. Faith, “the substance of things hoped for,” cannot co-exist with infallibility; nor can direction from God, the Father of our spirits, be required, if infallibility be resident in his earthly Church:—the Creator and the creature cannot be equally infallible. Hence, the doctrine of justification by faith

is frittered away by the Romish Church, for it is inconsistent with infallibility: and the doctrine of justification, which is proposed in the Tracts, scarcely, if at all, differs from that of the Romish Church.

Although our article affirms that General Councils have erred and may err, though this fact must be obvious to every one who reflects upon the nature of man, infallibility has been supposed to have dictated the decision of the Œcumenical Councils: yet it has not been shown how any number of men, individually fallible, should in the aggregate have become infallible. We do not understand the precaution, which is intended to qualify the assertion; viz., that a General Council *à parte ante*, when it first sits down, and continues to deliberate, is not said to be infallible in all its deliberations; but that one *de post facto*, after it is ended, and *admitted by the whole Church*, is infallible:—does infallibility, therefore, rest on the concurrence of the whole Church? Wherever this infallibility, however, may be conjectured to reside, the preceding remark will continue in full force, and the *proof* of infallibility will remain to be given. The opinions which are cited in support of this doctrine, are not our rules; they are destitute of all authority to impede the exercise of our judgments: nor can one scriptural passage be fairly and critically quoted in vindication of them. However the first six General Councils might have deserved well of the Church, they were nevertheless composed of fallible men: they might have decided conscientiously and according to the best of their ability on conflicted points; yet their decisions cannot be pronounced unerring. We, of the Church of England, are bound by the Articles to which we have subscribed; and as these propose to us the test of Holy Writ, we act consistently with the principles of our Church in allowing no other—as a *positive* rule of faith.

Since, in the motto prefixed to this article, it is asked if we can fix on any period of the Church in which doctrine remained for any time uncorrupted, and on that ground the necessity of a second reformation is intimated, it is uncommonly strange that the Fathers should be pressed into the service of this new reforming cause. By one of the party it has been admitted that their text is not perfect. Who now, then, can make it so? Ephrem Syrus, in Syriac and Greek, proves its incorrectness: and what has happened to his works must in some measure have happened to the text of the others:—Who can show, that, in parts, their writings have not been corrupted, altered, and modified, since the period of their composition? Who can show, that some of their traditions may not be found in

the Talmud? The propensity of some of the Fathers to bring Scriptural events into comparison with the Gentile philosophy and mythology, occasionally caused them to swerve from the true interpretation of the sacred text; and conducted them to puerilities unworthy of the cause which they were defending. Their extraordinary doctrines about dæmons, and the belief that some appear to have indulged, respecting the origin of the Gentile gods, give to us but a low notion of their intellectual powers. When, in allusion to the Christian doctrines, we read that Mercury was the interpretive Logos and teacher of all, and Æsculapius the physician, who after having been struck with the thunderbolt ascended to Heaven; that as to Christ's birth from a virgin, the story of Perseus made the belief of the fact common to Christians and Pagans; and that the cure of the lame, paralytic, and diseased, and the resuscitation of the dead, were equally attributed to Æsculapius, &c. &c., though they take care to admit the Evangelical account to be the only true one, assuredly there is sufficient in their pages to discourage us from giving to these writers the hermeneutical rank which is demanded for them. Besides, they were often very loose in their quotations of the Scriptures: they very frequently misquoted them, and as often misinterpreted them. The most learned, such as Clemens Alexandrinus, went astray in their theories, and proposed things for acceptance which were manifestly wrong. We grant that they were good men, and were desirous of serving the cause for which many of them surrendered their lives: yet these things do not elevate their judgment to a standard which we are bound to follow. However we may respect them, it should not therefore be expected that we should implicitly trust to their guidance; much less so, when we can clearly detect corruptions in their text and errors in their opinions.

Justin Martyr, early as he is, can very little be trusted. He says, that the dæmons, on hearing baptism preached by St. John, caused those who entered into their temples to sprinkle themselves with water; and, endeavouring to interpret the Scriptures according to his own ideas, he speaks of a *μεταβολή* in the Eucharistic elements, from which some have defended transubstantiation, and others consubstantiation. But even where the Fathers mention the customs of their times, it is plain that many of those customs would be unsuited to our age, such as the *congregational kiss* recorded by Justin Martyr. *Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν.* It is, moreover, manifest that, at a very early period, additions were made to the apostolic practice: for although Christ only instituted bread and wine as memorials of his passion, and although St. Paul shows these to have been the elements used in the primitive Church, Justin

Martyr mentions also the use of water: and if we compare his account of the rite of baptism with that given by Tertullian, we shall perceive that in the days of the latter honey and milk were introduced. How then can we trust their account of the rites and ceremonies of the Church? When they detail those existing in their times, we must believe such to have then existed; but the preceding instances will show that because such services existed in their day, it will not follow, that they must have been coincident with those in the age of the Apostles.

In addition to other delusions, Justin believed that Christians in his time had the power of ejecting devils: lest our assertion be doubted, we subjoin his words. Δαιμονιολήπτους γὰρ πολλοὺς κατὰ παντὰ τον κόσμον, ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΉΜΕΤΕΡΑ ΠΟΛΕΙ πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνθρώπων, τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ἐπορκίζοντες κατὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἐπορκιστῶν καὶ ἐπαστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν μὴ ἰαθέντας, ἰάσαντο, ΚΑΙ ΕΤΙ ΝΥΝ ΙΟΝΤΑΙ, καταργοντες καὶ ἐκδιώκοντες τοὺς κατέχοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δαιμοναί. *Ap. ii. 45.** Equal absurdities respecting the cross, sometimes compared to the horn of the unicorn, &c., and other things, may plentifully be found in the Fathers; and if such errors abounded so early as the days of Justin, common sense and actual investigation assure us that they were not diminished as time advanced. A determination of this allegation is in a great degree in every one's power, who will consult Suicer's Thesaurus; but the specimens which we have given may fairly be adjudged ample for our present purpose. We only add, that our motto is verified as to the corruptions which took place, asking, if this charge can be maintained from Justin's works, why should implicit reliance be placed on Irenæus, whose date is not so early, and whose absurdities are equally gross?

We have already gone to a great length on the subject of Tradition: we might go much farther. Notwithstanding the extraordinary authority to which it has been raised, and the great stress which has been laid upon it, we read (No. 5. p. 13.), as if these writers were orthodox on the point, that the Church "puts the Bible into the hand of every member of her communion, and calls upon him to believe nothing as necessary to salvation which shall not appear on mature examination to be set down therein, or at least to be capable to be proved thereby;" and at No. 38. p. 12, that the Roman Catholic doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural. But Professor Keble's sermon is utterly irreconcilable with this statement; so are many parts of the Tracts: for there, Tradition is elevated to a

* He asserts the same thing 247, 302, &c.

standard far beyond that which these quotations ascribe to it. When, however, Justin Martyr, in many places, assures us that the ἀπομνημονεύματα of the Apostles were the Gospels, and Irenæus identifies Tradition with the written Word, we are authorised to suppose that the writers of the Tracts were mistaken in the rank which they have given to Tradition on patristical authority, and that this rank was really intended by the Fathers to be assigned to the Scriptures. As there is scarcely an absurdity which will not find its voucher in Tradition, we cannot be too careful, lest we exalt it to too high a character in our Church. It matters not that certain Fathers may say that such and such things were received from the Apostles: they give no evidence that these things were received from them—none that they did not, through mere Tradition, reach their times; consequently their vague assertion can only be valued according to the matter which it contains. The preceding instances of Baptism and the Eucharist, to which many others might be added, are sufficient to show the falsehood of patristical Tradition in many points. But if Tradition at so early a period was false respecting the two sacraments of the Christian faith, can we expect it to be purer in minor particulars? Our Article has, therefore, rightly decided on the point in debate: and we shall do well if we restrict ourselves to its sense.

Nevertheless, in No. 45. p. 1, we find that—

“ At the Reformation the authority of the Church was discarded by the spirit then predominant among Protestants, and Scripture was considered as the sole document both for ascertaining and proving our faith. The question immediately arose, is this or that doctrine in the Scripture? and in consequence various intellectual gifts, such as argumentative subtlety, critical acumen, knowledge of the languages rose into importance, and became the interpreters of Christian truth. Exposition lay through controversy. Now the natural effect of disputation is to make us shun all but the strongest proofs, those which an adversary will find substantial impediments in his line of reasoning, and, therefore, to generate a cautious discriminative turn of thought, to fix in the mind a *standard* of proof simulating demonstration, and to make light of mere probabilities..... It followed, that in course of time all the delicate shades of truth and falsehood, the unobtrusive indications of God's will, the low tones of the still small voice, in which Scripture abounds, were rudely rejected: the crumbs from the rich man's table, which faith eagerly looks about for, were despised by the proud-hearted intellectualist.”

Here it is admitted, that at the Reformation, the Scripture was the sole test of faith; and as Bishop Marsh has shewn, the fundamental principle of the Reformation was opposed to the Traditions which are now advocated. The sequel, connected

with the other passages, which enforce the necessity of a *second* Reformation, gives to us the most convincing proof, that the real doctrines of the writers are not the doctrines of our Church. In the exposition of the books in which the doctrines of our religion are preserved, who can show that critical acumen and a knowledge of the languages are unnecessary?—if exposition lay through a controversy, the fact disproved not their necessity. Do not the things which are now sought to be appended to, or rather substituted for our services, and the things which are proposed to undermine our Protestant belief, evince that we should require the strongest proofs, and that we should make light of mere probabilities? Can one early or late Father be produced whose credulity does not subject him to the suspicion of being an unsafe conveyancer of apostolic practice? If any documents beyond the scriptural be made the subjects of appeal for ascertaining and proving what should be our faith—if thus another standard of doctrine be erected, assuredly the importance of the proposition requires from us, that all the aids of human learning, every power of the mind, and the extreme of caution be employed in the inquiry, and that the sternest rules of criticism be enforced in investigating the merits or demerits of those documents. If a curse be pronounced against him who adds to the Word of God, does not that curse exist in its vigour against the addition of doctrines not to be proved by the word of God? The application of the writer's remarks to Baptism and Episcopacy will not even hold good: because every candid reasoner must admit that infantine baptism must have been included in that of the households recorded in the sacred page—doubtless also in that of the multitudes that flocked to the Jordan, where John baptised:—because likewise Episcopacy is directly asserted in St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, with a clear definition of its duties, and may be proved by the civil ἐπισκοποι, mentioned by Cicero to have been not a mere title, but one appertaining to a very high office.

When Dr. Hook says in his Sermon, that we, who oppose the Oxford-party, “are confessedly, so far as the Church and the *English* Reformers are concerned, on the weak side,” he makes an assertion which may be easily refuted. This refutation has been splendidly made by a writer in *Fraser's Magazine* (No. cix.), and is so perfect, that an attempt to improve it would be supererogatory. Is it daringly intimated, that the discipline and practice which are unfolded in the Oxford Tracts are conformable to the system of our Church and the principles of the *English* Reformers? We cannot better explain our ideas of the insidiousness of these productions, than by citing the article to

which we have referred, where the case of a zealous minister, resident in the country, having been imagined, the writer conjectures, that .

“ After a long tranquillity...the calm is broken. Some new comer perhaps, whether lay or clerical, but possessing property and influence, begins to write and circulate a series of tracts. He writes one on the text, ‘ *My Father is greater than I,*’ in which he argues, in a very quiet and insinuating manner, that these words mean exactly what they appear to mean, and neither more nor less. He then issues a second, on the text, ‘ *Of that day and hour knoweth no man—no, nor the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father.*’ He merely recapitulates his former argument, doubling its strength by this second proof. He next produces a dexterous selection of passages from ancient writers, so arranged or contrived as to appear to support his views. And thus he proceeds, without noise or wrangling, silently to undermine the faith, and to unsettle the minds of the inhabitants; and to shake, without any open opposition, the whole system of Christian doctrine, in which it had been their pastor’s constant effort to build them up.”

This description is the positive truth; a more correct picture could not be drawn; the plan, and the mischief produced by the execution of it are portrayed to the life. In perfect harmony, too, with the spirit of Jesuitism, we, who are defending the Church, and sounding the alarm, are depicted by Dr. Hook and his friends as *the assailants*; whilst Ultra-Protestantism and other obnoxious terms are directed against us. The intolerance of Popery already adheres to them.

“ Imagine then,” as the writer continues, “ a third party, a visitant, to come among them, and, having some public opportunity of taking notice of these proceedings, to seize that opportunity to rebuke not the propagation of false doctrine, but the defender of truth! Imagine him lamenting *the want of union*, the discord that prevailed, and concluding by regretting that he, who ought to have been the minister of peace, had in this instance become *the assailant*, and had shown himself rather the wolf to bite and devour, than the lamb to endure with meekness and long suffering.”

Would not, as it is asked, Dr. Hook indignantly rebut the imputation, and strongly deny, that he was the *assailant*? Would, we may also inquire, any one of these clergymen, who might be possessed of a benefice in which he had begun to disseminate his peculiar doctrines and Tracts, and find adherents to them, quietly submit to the circulation of other tracts invalidating his assertions, warning his flock against their tendency, and bringing against his appeals to the Fathers translations of the errors of the Fathers? Would he patiently submit to such an intrusion

in his parish, as that of which the Oxford Pamphleteers are guilty on a most extensive scale toward the Church in general?

That the defenders of the Church should be treated as the fosterers of the schism, the repellers of the attack as the authors of the attack, that their arguments should be called abuse or irreverence, is perfectly consonant to the genius of Jesuitism. That the press should be commanded to the greatest possible extent, that the poison may be circulated more rapidly in the veins of the empire, is in exact keeping with the recommendations of Froude. But the inertia of our ecclesiastical authorities, particularly of those within the province and diocese in which the mischief has uninterruptedly been permitted to mature itself, and the easy manner by which very many of the clergy have been drawn into the snare, perceiving no more danger than he who securely walks where a mine has been prepared for explosion under his feet, are most astonishing:—whilst others have exposed the plot and awoke the energies of the friends to Protestantism, they fondly yet strangely think, that those who are sapping the foundations are actually strengthening the walls of our Zion. Still more astonishing is it, that they who glory in the Reformation have not taken alarm at the expressions applied to it, that they cannot perceive that it is attempted to bring them back to what our homily correctly calls “*the stinking puddle of men’s Traditions*,” through which it is intended, that they shall wade in all their slimy foulness to Popery.

O navis, referunt in mare te novi
Fluctus? O! quid agis? FORTITER OCCUPA
PORTUM.

The reception, *in part*, of doctrines essentially Popish, would soon prepare the way for the adoption *of the whole*: nor can any one calculate how rapid would be the progress. The tenets rejected by the Protestants have so frequently been demonstrated to be allied to Paganism, and have lately been so clearly detected in the Brahminical and Chinese systems, that it is strange how any can desire to annex them to the religion of Christ. Dr. Wiseman, also, has claimed such a harmony with Mr. Newman’s principles, that nothing but the strongest delusion can continue the blindness of any real friend to our Church: and Mr. Welby Pugin, whilst he has been pouring forth the coarsest abuse on Protestantism in general, has so vindicated these writers and their practice, that we plainly may perceive in what light the Papists regard them. The insufficiency of Scripture, too, is a doctrine so very startling, that it is of itself calculated to create a general alarm, a well-founded misgiving of its abettors. But if Scripture is profitable *for all things*, having a promise

of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, it cannot be insufficient: whereas, if it must be explained by Tradition, its sufficiency is virtually denied, and it will too soon become a sealed book, as in the Romish Church, where the few permitted to read it, read it through a corrupt version, and according to Popish expositions. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, says: χάρις παρὰ Θεοῦ μόνη εἰς τὸ συνιέναι τὰς γραφὰς αὐτοῦ 'εδόθη μοί' ἥς χάριτος καὶ πάντας κοινωνοὺς ἀμισθωτὶ καὶ ἀφθόνην παρακαλῶ γίνεσθαι, ὅπως μὴ καὶ τούτου χάριν κρίσιν ὀφλήσω ἐν ἡπὲρ μέλλει κρίσει διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς ποιῆσθαι, to which equivalent passages may be added from other Fathers.

Conformably to this bold system, Tract No. 80 treats of reserve in communicating religious knowledge. It is written with great care and consummate art: it cautiously and plausibly seeks to verify the position from the Scriptures. Although the Breviary is only once directly quoted in it, and the reference made to the seven daily prayers is not prominent, its tendency cannot be mistaken. It is one of the longest in the series, and full of debatable matters: it is one in which the perversions of the sense of the word of God are very daring, and its exclusive object seems to be the production of that reserve respecting the Scriptures which is the baleful characteristic of the Romish Church. If the interpretations be true, the Scriptures have an exoteric and esoteric signification; a hidden force, beyond the apparent, which we must suppose known only to the *μεμνημένοι* or *τελείοι*. But is not this a position which every Christian must reject, as positively contradicted by a multitude of passages? There may be mysteries, such as the Incarnation and the Trinity: but all that is necessary for our direction through this life to a better is plainly and intelligibly revealed. There is no reserve concerning our duty, and there should be none in communicating religious knowledge, since none exists in the sacred page. The Scriptures are a rule both of faith and practice, though these writers may deny it.

At p. 74 of this Tract, the *explicit* and *prominent* bringing forwards of the Atonement on all occasions is pronounced to be "evidently opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture, to which *not any sanction* is found in the Gospels, and one only *at first sight* in the Epistles of St. Paul." If there be a subject on which there is less *reserve* than another, it is the Atonement: it is the groundwork of the Christian system, and is plainly declared in the Gospels and in the Epistles.

The writer, conscious that a host of passages may be cited in disproof of his asseveration, boldly undertakes to interpret some, and contrives to elicit from them a meaning consentaneous to his

declaration. When St. Paul describes himself as always preaching Christ crucified, or glorying in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, though the writer concedes that the words implied the Atonement, we nevertheless, read,

“But it is a great mistake to suppose that they contain nothing more; or that, by preaching the Atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by Christ crucified. It may be seen, by an attention to the context, in all the passages where these expressions occur, that it is a very different view, and, in fact, *the opposite to the modern notion*, which St. Paul always intends by it. It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation together with him, mortification of the flesh, being made conformable to his sufferings and death.”

This evidently is a mere garbling of the words; for unless the Atonement be *explicitly* and *prominently* brought forwards, the practical inference would be without a basis; for how can this humiliation, mortification, conformity to Christ's sufferings and death, be enforced, unless the Atonement, as the sole reason, be *most directly* asserted? A mere implication of it would not have sufficed: the doctrine of Christ crucified would have been no doctrine without the clear elucidation, the *prominent* production of it in the primitive age of the Church:—nor will it be now. How can Christ otherwise have been preached as the Saviour? In what but the Atonement did the Salvation consist? What means “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us?”—What, “in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins?”—What, “that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby?” And what mean those passages which mention his having made peace through the blood of his cross, his reconciliation of us in the body of his flesh through death, his having borne our sins in his own body on the cross, and other like expressions, but the doctrine of the Atonement? Is it not therefore *explicitly* and *prominently* brought forward? And does not this doctrine also pervade our liturgical services and our homilies? That the prevalent notion in the Church *diminishes* “a sense of responsibility and consequent humiliation” (we need only say) is untrue: and we are not aware that the doctrine is taught apart from an enforcement of its practical effects. But if *fasts* and *penances*, as in the Romish Church, be intended by this humiliation, mortification, and conformity to Christ's sufferings and death, in which conjecture many parts of these Tracts would support us, we can comprehend the charge.

In the same insidious manner it has been sought to undermine other leading doctrines of our Church, which attempts have

been sufficiently exposed by others.* But it may be asked, if

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 85.

“ ‘ Faith is reliance on the word of another : the word of another is in itself a faint evidence compared with that of sight or reason. It is influential only when we cannot do without it. We cannot do without it, when it is our informant about things which we cannot do without. Things we cannot do without are things which we desire. They who feel they cannot do without the next world go by faith (not that sight would not be better), because they have no other means of knowledge to go by. “ To whom shall they go ? ” If they will not believe the word preached to them, what other access have they to the next world ? Love of God led St. Peter to follow Christ, and love of God and Christ leads men now to love and follow the Church.

“ ‘ Let us then say, if we give up the Gospel as we have received it, in the Church, to whom shall we go ? It has the words of eternal life in it ; where else are they to be found ? Is there any other religion to choose but that of the Church ? Shall we go to Mahometanism or Paganism ? But we may seek some heresy or sect : true, we may ; but why are they more sure ? Are they not a part, while the Church is the *whole* ? Why is the part true, if the whole is not ? Why is not that evidence trustworthy for the whole which is trustworthy for a part ? Secretaries commonly give up the Church’s doctrines, and go by the Church’s Bible ; but if the doctrines cannot be proved true, neither can the Bible : they stand or

Wiseman’s Ninth Lecture.

“ ‘ Religion must be a path palpable and pervious equally to the poor as to the rich ; practicable to the feeble as well as the strong ; it must be a system which, while it satisfies, by its rigid demonstration, the scruples of the learned, explains itself by the simplicity of its proofs, to the untutored inquirer. Its discovery cannot be meant to occupy the whole of life in search,—its acquisition cannot be intended to absorb all our mind by difficulties. It must be a system of belief, not of doubt ; a state of peace, and not of uneasiness. It cannot, therefore, consist in the discussion of every separate point, which requires time, labour, and talent, and ends in perplexity and agitation ; it must be some visible and comprehensive whole, which unites and combines in itself the entire of God’s revelation and law. In other words, it cannot consist in a mere gleaning of detached articles of faith from the most discordant communities, but it must be one of the numerous divisions of Christians which is the depositary and holds archives of the whole doctrine of Christ Jesus.

* * *

“ ‘ Reason then in like manner now. Think not to discover the only true Church of Christ by the painful task of minute examination ; but seek out some *great and striking system* which may verify prophecy, and answer to the attributes of its founder. Let it be as the mountain raised upon the top of hills,—a land-mark, drawing towards it the gaze of nations, and a

these writings have not a Papistical tendency, why are such subjects, as Prayers for the Dead, Fasts, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, and the like, so diffusely discussed? And since the explanatory statements are more powerful than the objections offered to the doctrines, can we rationally suppose them to have been selected for any other purpose, than that of making known these Popish tenets? If the writers had been sincerely attached to the Church, they would not have seen a necessity of bringing forward these dissertations at all, at least not in the manner which they have, nor with the meagre refutations which they have offered; and when we find them regretting that they have not the seven daily services, sneering at the Reformation,

fall together. If we begin, we must soon make an end. On what consistent principle can I give up part and keep the rest? No: I see *a great work* before me, professing to be the work of that God whose being and attributes I feel within me to be real. Why should not this great sight be—what it professes to be—his presence? *Why* should not *the Church be divine*? The burden of proof surely is on the other side. I will accept her doctrines, and her rites, and her Bible—not one and not the other, but all—till I have clear proof that she is mistaken. It is, I feel, God's will that I should do so; and, besides, I love these her possessions,—I love her Bible, her doctrines, and her rites, and *therefore* I BELIEVE.'

rallying point, attracting the tribes of the earth to ascend. Let it be a kingdom worthy of the Son of David, refusing every name but that which designates its universal dominion, truly extending in unity of government from sea to sea, and holding in willing submission the utmost bounds of the earth.

* * *

In fine, let it be one from which all others profess to have separated, but which has never departed from any; one from which others make it their boast that they have received priesthood, authority, and the word of God, but which itself scorns to derive them from any but the Eternal Founder of Christianity. If you find but one system which possesses all these qualities, and yet more,—if you find only *one* which pretends to possess them; oh, by what principle of reason, or even of self-love, will you justify your refusal to embrace it? By what plea, before God, will you excuse any delay to study and examine its claims?

“It is only necessary to make one observation. When the writer of this Tract says, that ‘the Church is the whole;’ and that therefore to the Church he will cling, it is perfectly obvious and undeniable that it cannot be any *Protestant Church* of which he is speaking!”—*Fraser's Magazine*.

and stealthily suggesting alterations, all of which are closely approximated to the Roman ritual, it is not too much to say that, if they really be not covert Papists, they are very equivocal Protestants. In many parts of their conduct they strongly remind us of Virgil's Sinon.

This inclination to accommodate our venerable Church to that of Rome is increasing; and a writer in the 85th No. of the *British Magazine* appears to object to the use of the gown in the pulpit, *suspecting it to be "a rag of Presbyterianism:"* another, in the 86th No. of the same work, translates prayers from the Popish Hours for our devotions, and mentions them with superabundant praise. The translator assures us that there is in them "*a remarkable freedom from Popish sentiment:*" but his proofs are so *singular*, that we will transcribe his words:—

"There is, as the reader will observe here, as well as in my former number, a remarkable freedom from Popish sentiment in the language of these devotions, *though it is but just to add, that at the end of each one of them the words in red, "Pater noster," and some of them "Ave Maria," remind us that they were written at a time when the forms of true and false worship were most artfully blended together. The number of fifteen, to which these prayers amount, may be perhaps accidental, but it is more probably in conformity with the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary, viz., the five joyful, the five sorrowful, and the five glorious mysteries, which is a favourite subject in the writings of the period when these prayers were composed.*"

But it must seem a thing difficult of comprehension, if this school be, as it in some places pretends, averse to Romanism, how it can reconcile to a dislike of Romanism its continual habit of selecting the writings of the Popish Church as worthy of the attention of its readers. In the Tracts themselves, we do not discover the full degeneracy: but since in the other works issued by their writers, it is discoverable in a manner which cannot be palliated; it is not fair to deny our charge, as some have attempted. The Tracts merely pioneer the way to the greater mischief. Thus after *they* had prepared the way by specimens of the Breviary, the hymns of the Breviary were forced on our attention by another:—*is this consistent with an aversion to Romanism?* Besides, these hymns cannot be referred to the primitive Church, which on some occasions is made the standard; and their miserable Latin is a plain proof that they are wanting in the proper antiquity. The frequent reference to the Sibyl, who with Hydaspes, (according to another reading Hystaspis) as frequently occurs in the Fathers in the same trifling manner, is so widely different from the style of the Apostles, that whilst it

shows the hymns to be unsuited to Christian purposes, it determines them to be forgeries. Is such trash as

Dies iræ, dies illa
 Sœclum solvet in favillâ,
 Teste David cum Sibyllâ,

or

Si non suis vatibus
 Credat, *vel* gentilibus
 Sibyllinis versibus
 Hæc prædicta,

either in the language or matter, fit to be put in competition with our authorized version of the Psalms, or even with many of the hymns which have lately been introduced into the churches?

Yet these and others, translated from the Roman, are offered to us as a *Protestant* Breviary; and lest we should be in doubt of the translator's private creed, the work is ornamented with crucifixes, representations of cherubs and the Virgin Mary, and other devices, such as may be seen in decorated Missals and Hours—probably that the beauty might allure where the matter would not. The very gross parthenolatry and other superstitions of Rome are not even disguised, as we might have expected them to have been; and we are at a loss to understand how any of our clergy, seeing such productions from the *Officina Oxoniensis*, can still doubt the affection of the authors to Popery. First, as we have remarked, the spurious ancient liturgies are defended and lauded by Froude in the Tracts; then specimens of the Breviary, translated and accommodated to general use, follow in the same series: these having been conceived to have properly acted on the minds of *the disciples*, at last the abominable translations of the hymns are offered to the public. But notwithstanding all this, what have the Archbishop, the Bishop, or the University done in their duty to the Church? Is the flock to be scattered, because there is *no shepherd*? (Ezek. xxxiv. 5.) And may not the threat be executed? (v. 8.)

“As I live, saith the Lord God, surely because my flock became a prey, and my flock became meat to every beast of the field, *because there was no shepherd, neither did my shepherds search for my flock, but the shepherds FED THEMSELVES, and fed not my flock*; therefore, O, ye shepherds, hear the word of the Lord; Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the shepherds **FED THEMSELVES** any more.”

In examining Froude's *Remains*, in which his daring purposes

are developed, enough, it might be thought, had been shown of the nature of this schism; but we understand that there are those who choose to separate Froude's doctrines from the doctrines of the Tracts. But as Froude was a writer in the Tracts, nay, one of no small weight, a suggester of plan and subjects, and as many of the papers are manifestly an execution of his suggested plan—as two of the editors of the Tracts were the editors of his posthumous volumes—and as, however they may now seek to evade an identification with his opinions, they professedly edited those opinions *on account of the truth and EXTREME importance of his views*, they cannot shuffle out of their responsibility, and their friends cannot separate the designs of Froude from the designs of the others. Mr. Newman's work on Romanism, in which the main points are abandoned and the weakest only assailed, just as we read in the instructions to the Jesuits in the beginning of this article, has likewise been proved in other works to be so nearly allied to the creed of Rome in its doctrines, and so opposed to the articles of the Church, that we are further strengthened in asserting the tendency of all these writings to be Papistical.

When, moreover, in Tract 71, p. 3, our gratitude is demanded “to the particular branch of the Church Catholic through which God made us Christians, through which we were new-born, instructed, and (if so be) ordained to the ministerial office;” and when we read in Dr. Pusey's reply to one of his antagonists, which immediately precedes this very Tract—“but is it then a duty to forget that Rome was our mother, through whom we were born to Christ—that she was the instrument chosen by God's good providence to bring the Gospel to the wild heathen tribes, from which most of us are sprung?” and call to mind his sermon lately preached at *Melcombe Regis, can we doubt

* We quote, in explanation, the following letter published in the *Record*:—

“DR. PUSEY *versus* BEDE.

“*To the Editor of the Record.*

“Sir,—Dr. Pusey, in his notes appended to his Sermons, preached at Melcombe Regis, in behalf of the ‘Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,’ has, in that ‘On Cathedral and Collegiate Institutions,’ endeavoured to show, by quotations from ‘*Bede*,’ that we are principally indebted to the ROMAN Austin for the revival of Christianity in Britain, after the invasion of the Saxons. It is astonishing how the *bias* of Dr. Pusey's mind in favour of *Romanism*, or at least of what is called ‘*apostolical succession*,’ has prevented him from fairly presenting to his readers the *facts*, in reference to this point, as given by *Bede himself*, from whom Dr. Pusey's information,

that Rome is the particular branch of the Church Catholic here intended, *to whose saints we owe a debt of reverence and affection?* that notwithstanding the weak and desultory attacks on Romanism in this collection, every art is employed to represent it as fascinating, and to allure us to it? The proposition to erase from the prospectus "*against the errors of the Church of Rome,*" and the word "*Protestant,*" at the meeting convened in Oxford to erect a monument to the memories of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, is a distinct proof that we misjudge not this new party in the Church; and not all the ingenuity which

as far as it goes, is principally derived. Dr. Pusey *entirely* omits all reference to the account given by Bede, in the 2d chapter of his 2d book, of the *refusal* of the *British bishops* to submit to Austin's demands, and the result which followed, namely, the *murder* of 1,200 *ecclesiastics, natives* of Britain, at the instigation of *Austin*. In the 4th chapter of his 2d book, Bede gives us the epistle of Laurence, Austin's *successor*, of Mellitus, Bishop of London, and Justus, of Rochester, to the Irish bishops and abbots, in which is the following passage:—'*We once thought better of the Irish than of the Britons; but we have since learned from Daganus, one of your bishops, that the Irish differ in nothing from the British in their manner of living: for Bishop Daganus would not so much as eat under the same roof with us, much less sit at the same table with us.*' In his 3d book, 8d chapter, Bede shows that the *whole* kingdom of Northumberland was re-evangelized by bishops of the *old National Church of Britain*, who never had any connexion whatever with *Rome*; and that '*monasteries*' were instituted by the royal bounty of *Oswald*, whose territories consisted of all northern England, and part even of *Scotland*. In short, all the *rest* of England, with the exception of *Kent*—into which Austin was an *intruder*—as there was already a church there,—and the counties of *Norfolk* and *Suffolk*—where a bishop in communion with the Church of Rome laboured, having also intruded,—was indebted to its own *native* clergy and Irish *missionaries* under Aidan, who had never any *communion with Rome*, for the *revival* of Christianity. Such is the real historical *fact*, as may be seen by consulting Bede and *Soame's Anglo-Saxon Church*; and nothing but a strong and unfortunate bias in Dr. Pusey's mind to *Romanism*—for he says, '*We were born to Christ through Rome,*'—and a determination to cleave to the dogma of '*apostolic succession,*' which is *exclusively identified* with *Romanism*, could have so warped his judgment as to state the matter as he has done. In the 82d page of his second Sermon, there is a most *unfair* quotation from the Homily on '*Almsgiving,*' which, had it been a *whole*, and not a *partial* quotation, would have, instead of supporting his *own view* in the sermon, as it respects *charity*, flatly contradicted it. But, alas! how will prejudice and a determination to cleave to a system blind the judgment! I am, sir, yours, &c.

"November 10."

"LATIMER."

can be exerted, nor all these *gentle* exposures of Popish error cannot dim the truth which this circumstance discovers.

The schism is ramified, and is widened in different ways. Persons who, but for their advocacy of this Church-dividing cause, would have been unknown, have even proceeded to the temerity of assailing the Protestant exposition of the prophecies which relate to the Roman apostasy. Antichrist is interpreted quite in another light; and zeal has even led more than one into the absurdity of maintaining that the part of the prediction which makes "forbidding to marry" a criterion, has been fulfilled in the late marriage act. The act is unholy and bad enough; but it *forbids not* to marry; and any fair expositor would perceive that the fulfilment must have a greater scope. Where such shuffling, such weakness, such arrant nonsense are pressed into the service—where such paltry and overstrained statements are produced in defending Popery against the words of St. Paul, is it possible to disguise from our convictions that those who resort to these things are its secret friends?

In this novel style of Biblical criticism a certain Rev. Mr. Todd has distinguished himself. In this manner he has vigorously laboured to set Romanism *ὁρθῶς πρὸς*, and has not hesitated to assert that Protestant theologians do not rightly understand 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3. He avers that the Church of Rome cannot be said to have apostatized from the faith once delivered to the saints, because it retains the essential doctrines of Christianity, such as the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Epiphany. Although the greatest errors have been introduced into it; although men, and often very bad men, have been canonized with the grossest idolatry, nevertheless, according to Mr. Todd, it has kept the faith. We cannot understand how a Church that is confessed to have vitiated the faith, can still be asserted to have kept it.

The case seems to us very analogous to that of the Jewish Formalists, who multiplied rite upon rite, but destroyed the efficacy of religion by cumbrous superstitions and ridiculous traditions, who paid tithes of mint, cummin, and anise-seed very scrupulously, but entirely omitted the weightier matters of the law. It is granted that the Romanists admit the historical truths of the New Testament; but what avails this admission when their practice is very far removed from its precepts? Of what avail to them are these historical truths, if they be overclouded by legends and degraded by superstitious observances? and how can the Papists be said not to be the predicted apostasy, when all the predicted criteria of it are minutely manifested in them? If, by means of tradition, the Pharisees

made the word of God of none effect, what was applied on that account to them might be applied to the others; and if the Jews, in our Saviour's time, by teaching the doctrines and commandments of men, worshipped God in vain, the same must be predicated of those who equally rely on humanly devised doctrines and precepts; and as the Papists do this in the fullest degree, and otherwise exemplify the foretold apostasy, it must be admitted that they have apostatized from the faith.

We now advance to *positive* proof of the Papistical tendency of these Tracts. The 75th Tract treats of the Roman Breviary, and affirms, that "there is *so much excellence and beauty* in the services of the Breviary, that were it skilfully set before the Protestant by Roman controversialists, as the book of Devotions received in their communion, *it would undoubtedly raise a prejudice in their favour*, if he were ignorant of the circumstances of the case, and *but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced*." To make him thus *ordinarily candid and unprejudiced*, this writer sets *its beauty and excellence* before the Protestant reader. In the same Tract it is said, "whatever is *good and true* in those Devotions will be claimed, and on reasonable grounds." Therefore, all that will be found in this Tract the writer may be presumed, on *reasonable grounds*, to have considered *good and true*. How far, too, "*a weapon has been wrested out of our adversaries' hands*," let the sequel decide. For "the publication of these selections, which it is proposed presently to give from these services, is, as it were, *an act of re-appropriation*." But ere the *re-appropriation* can be claimed, the original, or the documents whence the Roman Breviary was compiled, should have been produced:—the ancient Liturgies* will doubtless be raised to that authoritative rank; but they can only be pleaded for a part: however, as we shall hereafter discuss them, that question will be dismissed for the present.

One of the alleged motives for which the selection has been made is, that "it may suggest *character and matter for our private devotions*, OVER AND ABOVE what our reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public services; *an use of it which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun*." How, since our reformers were perfectly acquainted with the Breviary, and rejected all those parts which they accounted contrary to the Word of God, the *re-appropriation* of any such rejected parts can be *a completion of the work which they begun*, will require the utmost acumen of Jesuitical sophistry to explain to us.

* These Liturgies were only different modes of celebrating the Eucharist.

The attempt to retrace the constituent parts of these services to the apostolic times, although we have no doubt that certain established forms then existed, to which conclusion the nature of the Jewish worship and various texts in the New Testament very naturally lead us, will, if commenced, be found impracticable: nor can the seven hours of prayer be more easily established. Three hours of prayer, in conformity with the practice of Daniel, are mentioned in the Acts to have been observed by the Apostles:—to these the Jews assign a legendary origin, attributing the morning to Abraham, the midday to Isaac, the vesper to Jacob. But since a dispute arose about the observance of Jewish customs, and the council of Jerusalem, holden under James (Acts xv. 13, 21), relieved the Church from it with certain exceptions, into which these hours do not enter, we have no positive proof of their continued observance in the Christian Church; and the prayer of Paul and Silas at midnight proves nothing to the point. Moreover, since it is conceded that the increase of the three to seven took place “in subsequent times,” the difficulty of substantiating the authority of these seven becomes greater; and the concession proves them not to have been of apostolic date. The origin given of them at p. 5 of this Tract is clearly legendary. How far these wearisome services agree with the Divine and unrevoked law, *six days shalt thou labour, and do all that thou hast to do*, we inquire in vain. They must engender either formality or superstition, and do not accord with that mental and spiritual devotion which the Apostles enjoined.

After having stated, that “the invocations and services to the Blessed Virgin” are really *additions*, the writer adds: “this remark seems to apply to all the intrinsically exceptionable addresses in the Breviary: for as to the confession at prime and compline, in which is introduced the name of the Blessed Virgin and Saints, this practice stands on a different ground. It is not a simple gratuitous invocation made to them, but it is an address to Almighty God *in his heavenly Court*, as surrounded by his Saints and Angels, answering to St. Paul’s charge to Timothy, ‘before God and the LORD JESUS CHRIST and the elect Angels,’ and to Daniel’s and St. John’s address to the Angels who were sent to them.” Ere we notice this assertion, let us scrutinize the service at prime. In it we read—

“Ave Maria, gratiä plena! Dominus tecum! Benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus! Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis nunc et in horâ mortis nostræ! Amen!”

“Hail Mary, full of grace! The Lord be with thee! Blessed be thou among women, and blessed be Jesus, the fruit of thy womb! O

holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us now and in the hour of our death! Amen!

The confession, likewise, to which such a singular parallel has been found in St. Paul's words and Daniel's and St. John's address, is—

"Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, beatæ Mariæ semper Virgini, beato Michaeli Archangelo, beato Johanni Baptistæ, sanctis apostolis Petro et Paulo, omnibus sanctis et vobis, fratres; quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo, et opere; mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. Ideo precor beatam Mariam semper Virginem, beatum Michaelem Archangelum, beatum Johannem Baptistam, sanctos apostolos Petrum et Paulum, omnes Sanctos, et vos, fratres, orare pro me ad Dominum Deum nostrum."

"I confess to the omnipotent God, to the blessed Mary ever Virgin, to the blessed Michael the Archangel, to the blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, brethren; that I have too much sinned in thought, word, and deed. It is my fault, it is my fault, it is my exceedingly great fault.—Wherefore, I pray the blessed Mary ever Virgin, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, brethren, to pray for me to our Lord God."

Is this a mere address to Almighty God in his heavenly Court, as surrounded by his saints and angels? Let our readers in their own minds supply the commentary. In these pure primes we also discover—

"Sancta Maria et omnes Sancti intercedant pro nobis ad Dominum, ut nos mereamur ab eo adjuvari et salvari, qui vivit et regnat in sæcula sæculorum! Amen!"

"May the holy Mary and all the saints intercede for us to the Lord, that we may deserve to be aided and saved by him, who liveth and reigneth through eternal ages! Amen!"

In the equally pure complines the same confession occurs; also the following antiphona:

"Salve, Regina, mater misericordiæ, vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve! Ad te clamamus exules, filii Hevæ. Ad te suspiramus gementes, flentes in hac lacrymarum valle. Eia! ergo, advocata nostra, illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte. Et Jesum benedictum fructum ventris tui nobis post hoc exilium ostende. O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria!"

"Ora pro nobis, sancta Dei genitrix!"

Ut digni efficiamur promissionibus Christi!"

"Hail! O Queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope, hail! To thee we exiles, the sons of Eve, cry. To thee we sigh, groaning and weeping in this vale of tears. Come, then, O our advocate, turn those thy merciful eyes upon us! And after this exile shew us Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb. O clement, O pitiful, O sweet Virgin Mary!"

*pray for us, O holy mother of God,
that we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ !"*

Then follows this prayer :—

" Omnipotens, sempiternus Deus, qui gloriosæ Matris Mariæ corpus et animam, ut dignum Filii tui habitaculum effici mereretur, Spiritu Sancto cooperante præparasti, da, ut cujus commemoratione lætamur, *ejus piæ intercessionis* ab instantibus malis et perpetua morte liberemur, per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum ! Amen !

" O, omnipotent, everlasting God, who didst prepare the body and soul of Mary, the glorious Virgin, to be worthy of becoming a fit habitation for thy Son, grant, that as we rejoice in the commemoration of her, we may be delivered *by her pitiful intercession* from present evils and eternal death, through the same Christ our Lord ! Amen."

The preceding Ave Maria is also introduced into the complines; and from Advent to the Purification, instead of Salve Regina, Alma Redemptoris Mater, a most wretched doggrel, which we transcribe both in the original and translation, from p. 23 of this Tract, is used.

Alma Redemptoris Mater, *quæ pervia Cæli
Porta manes, et stella maris, succurre cadenti
Surgere qui curat, populo ; tu, quæ genuisti
Naturæ mirante, tuum Sanctum Genitorem,
Virgo, prius* ac posterius, Gabrielis ab ore
Sumens illud ave, peccatorum miserere !*

Kindly Mother of the Redeemer, *who art of Heaven
The open gate, and the star of the sea, aid a falling people
Which is trying to rise again : thou, who didst give birth,
While nature marvell'd how, to thy holy Creator,
Virgin, both before and after, from Gabriel's mouth
Accepting the All-Hail, be merciful towards sinners !"*

The epithet stella maris, or star of the sea, which is frequently attributed to the Virgin Mary, as also in the hymn,

Ave, maris stella, &c.,

is decidedly of pagan origin, and may be retraced in the term applied to Castor and Pollux,

(Sic fratres Helenæ, *lucida Sidera,*)

who, on that account, are called *σωτήρες*,† or Saviours.

Let it not be affirmed that we are quoting things which do

* Ac causes a false quantity in *prius*.

†quorum simul alba nautis

Stella refulsit,

Defluit saxis agitatus humor ;

Concidunt venti, fugiunt que nubes ;

Et minax (quod sic voluere) ponto,

Unda recumbit. *Hor. lib. 1. ode 2.*

not occur in these services thus offered *for our private devotions*, since, at pp. 61, 82, the Confession will be found; and although, at p 24, the Salve Regina is acknowledged to be “*beyond the power of defence, which might be available for less explicit compositions*,” at p. 86, together with Omnipotens, sempiternus Deus, it forms a portion of the *re-appropriation*. A marginal note, indeed, declares that it is one of the four antiphons on which the preceding animadversion was made; but that animadversion should have prevented its insertion. To animadvert on the four specified antiphons (pp. 23, 24,) on the question of doctrine is singularly absurd: for, as we have partly seen and shall still further see, the same doctrine is introduced into the body of this *Protestant Breviary*. In the hymns,* too, lately published, not only the Virgin Mary, but all the heavenly host, the company of the Patriarchs, the merits of the Prophets, the Baptist, “*the heavenly key-bearer*” Peter, and the other Apostles are implored to contribute their intercessions. Yet it is admitted, that Gavanti and Merari testified that neither of these four antiphons is to be discovered in ancient authors: on what principle then were they clothed in an English dress? On what principle was this selection offered for our *private devotions*? On what principle was a form of commemorating Bishop Ken *designed*? We err not when we firmly maintain that these things were done in the hope that, if adopted *in private*, at last they would also be adopted in PUBLIC DEVOTIONS.

The assertion that the services for the Transfiguration and the festival of St. Lawrence were superadded “*with a view of supplying specimens of a more elevated and impressive character*,” must convince every one, who is not wilfully blind, that the introduction of some form of Popery at least into our Church is the object of these men. That in honor of Bishop Ken is called a *design*; and a very bad one it is. The other *design*, too, “*for a service of thanksgiving and commemoration*

* *Et pia dei genitrix,
Salutem posce miseris.*

Again,

*Coetus omnes angelici,
Et patriarcharum cunei,
Et prophetarum merita
Nobis precentur veniam.*

Also,

*Baptista Christi prævius,
Et Claviger æthereus,
Cum cæteris apostolis
Nos solvant nexu criminis.*

for the anniversaries of the days of death of friends and relations" cannot be separated from the intent to introduce *prayers for the dead*, on which these writers have very equivocally expressed themselves; for they are men of too much perception not to be aware that these commemorations would unavoidably lead to them. The whole is concluded with an abstract of the services for every day in Advent.

In proof that, notwithstanding the animadversion on the four antiphons, equally indefensible doctrine may be seen in this collection of services, we cite from p. 53. in the Lauds:—

"Holy Mary, succour the wretched, help the weak-hearted, comfort the mourners, pray for the people, interpose for the clergy, intercede for the devoted females; let all feel thy assistance who observe thy holy commemoration."

"Pray for us, Holy Mother of God,

"That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ!"

We also find immediately afterwards,

"Grant, O Lord God, we beseech thee, that we thy servants may ever prosper in perpetual health of body and mind, and by the glorious intercession of the blessed Mary, ever-Virgin, may be delivered from present sadness, and enjoy eternal bliss."*

Can stronger evidence be desired?

The purpose of this Breviary having been fully disclosed, in the manner which we have stated, the direct worship of the Virgin Mary occurring in it, and her intercessorial character having been recognised, the most idolatrous specimens having been produced and made known to the public, under the flimsy plea of condemning them, and things identical in doctrine having been nevertheless inserted, we, calling to mind the words which, on a former occasion, we adduced from the 71st Tract, respecting this parthenolatry and hagiolatry, affirm, that we have justified our position that these Tracts have a Papistical tendency. The declaration in the *Via Media* (No. 38, p. 5.) that "Churchmen of this day have deviated from the opinions of our reformers, and become more opposed than they were, to the system they protested against," is not to be demonstrated; yet, were it demonstrable, it would form no plea for our lapsing into the very "system they protested against." It would be no reason why Protestants should become Romanists. It would, to use Froude's words, verily *break the limb of the Reformation*

* It is rather curious, that whilst this school lays such an extravagant stress on Ecclesiastical Tradition, it has not attempted to reconcile the title "Ever-Virgin" with the Tradition, which represents the brethren of Jesus mentioned in the Gospels as Mary's subsequent children by Joseph.

to set it again most crookedly. How then can any of our clergy assert the orthodoxy† of these writers, merely stating that there are parts in their writings of which they disapprove? Are these the parts? If so, are they not sufficient to disprove the orthodoxy of the authors?—sufficient to rouse the whole Church, and to excite its opposition?

These additions are plainly designed as *improvements* to our present Liturgy: else, why were they offered to us? Mr. Russell says, “it is one thing to maintain against Romanists that our present communion-service contains all that is essential to its *validity*, and another, to desire its further *improvement*.—Let the candid reader compare the offices of the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. and of the Reformed Church in Scotland and America, with the primitive Liturgy of Jerusalem, and he will see how much nearer they correspond with that venerable service than our own.” Is it with the object of introducing these *improvements*, that the Tracts commenced with stating the various objections which have been made to separate parts of our services? We, however, fully agree with the words of the Tract No. 40, in the wish, “that people, who are so much wiser and more delicate, than the Prayer-book, would look a little into their Bibles too. And when they have well reformed both, we shall see how purely the word will go on:”—also with those of No 3, “My dear Brethren, I beseech you to consider, with me, whether you ought not to *resist the alteration of even one jot or tittle of it*, (viz. THE LITURGY)—on looking back, *after the mischief is done*, what excuse shall we be able to make for ourselves *for having encouraged such proceedings?*” (viz. the *alterations*). But the plan is more developed in the sequel—the plan, as we have described it, peeps out of its Jesuitical envelopment, not only where the Burial-service is concerned, but where, *even under the plea* of defending our services against innovations and alterations, *things, which may possibly require an emendation*, are pointed out. It is much like the plan of defending a city by disclosing to the enemy every part that is imagined to be a weak point.

In No. 9, the devotional hours of the ancient Christians are strangely identified with the *Horæ Canonicae* or the Roman Catholic Hours; and David’s custom of praising God seven times a day is claimed in evidence of the deep antiquity of them: but there is no authority that there were seven stated diurnal periods of Jewish prayer. David may *privately* have praised God seven times a day; but he was not bound to that definite number by the Mosaic

† See Dr. Hook’s Sermon.

Law. So, as to the worship of the early Christians, Justin Martyr, the earliest of the Post-Apostolic Fathers, mentions not these hours; and Casaubon (*Exercit.* xvi. No. 41.) has clearly shown, from the Fathers themselves, that the *preces matutinæ, et vespertinæ*, the ἑσπεριναὶ καὶ ἑωθιναὶ λειτουργίαι in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus were those that they observed.

Thus the morning and evening prayers of our Prayer-book are defended by the very ecclesiastical antiquity to which such constant appeal is made; but no solid plea is given for the admission of supernumerary services. The animadversions which have been made on our offices, and the insidious hints at defects and required improvements which we have noticed, are strangely irreconcilable with other parts of the Tracts, and can only be explained on the principle which we stated at the commencement of this article. For instance, in the πολύμητις Richard Nelson (No. 22. p. 6.), we read —

“ Now, sir, it seemed to me such a thing for a clergyman, who had signed the Articles and Prayer-book, and had his maintenance from the Church, and had taken an oath before God and man to teach the truth to his flock, according to his Prayer-book; that a Church minister should speak so slightly of what he had solemnly assented to, and even sworn to: this seemed to me to be astonishing, and, I must confess to you, even shocking.”

So, in No. 43, p. 16, we read:—

“ We cannot stand by and see the noble old Prayer-book pulled to pieces, just to humour a mob of Tiptops, Gapes, and Yawns.”

Can a more biting satire or a severer criticism be pronounced on the party itself? However these ὥκα βέλη may be intelligible to themselves, confessedly ὡς τὸ πᾶν ἑρμηνέων χετίζει.

It now remains to direct our attention to the ancient Liturgies, which are claimed as the authorities for the desired improvements. Our remarks will be brief, since we have not space fully to discuss the subject; but the object will be answered, if they suffice to show how little credibility may critically be attached to these services. To this inquiry we are particularly led by the article on them in No. 63, which proceeded from Mr. Froude's pen.

The Liturgy of Jerusalem is unscrupulously denominated *primitive*. Its very title, however, is suspicious, which is ἡ θεία λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου καὶ ἀδελφοθέου Ἰακώβου; for the words belong not to the primitive age of Christianity. St. Paul (*Gal.* i. 19.) called James not ἀδελφοθέον, but τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. Expressions in ecclesiastical use long after the days of James, and never occurring in the genuine remains of the

Apostolic Fathers, are copiously scattered through it: the epithets are such as formed the delight of subsequent times. Christ is called *διφύης ἀνθραξ*; and *ὁμοούσιος*, a word which was the subject of later controversy, is several times repeated in it; nor are they phrases which the other writings of the apostolic age would induce us to assign to St. James. Can any one defend many words in the following prayer from the charge of having been written very long after the decease of the Apostles? Ὁ Κύριος εὐλογῆσαι καὶ ἀξιῶσαι ἡμᾶς σεραφικῶς δωροφορῆσαι, καὶ προσταῖσαι τὴν πολυῦμνητον ψδὴν τοῦ ἐνθεαστικῶν καὶ τρισαγίου, τῷ ἀνευδεῖ καὶ ὑπερπλήρει πάσης τῆς ἁγιαστικῆς τελειότητος, νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ. When we are expressly informed in Scripture that the dead *rest from their labours* and their works do follow them, is it likely that an apostle, or the immediate disciple of an apostle, would have written ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως τῶν προκεκοιμημένων, πατέρωντε, καὶ ἀδελφῶν, τὸν Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν? Is it likely that in the writings of the apostolic age we should see idolatrous laudations and supplications to the Virgin? such as τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπερενδόξου, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν, θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων καὶ δικαίων μνημονεύσαντες, ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἀλλήλοις καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ζωὴν ἡμῶν Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ παραθώμεθα, to which, in another part, where it is repeated, are added the words ὅπως εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις αὐτῶν οἱ πάντες ἔλεηθῶμεν. This commendation to the Virgin Mary and the saints, and this petition for their intercession; then either assure us, that the Liturgy of St. James was composed in a late age, or was so greatly corrupted, that even if it should contain portions of early worship, we cannot point them out, much less establish their authenticity. This Liturgy contains also such a decided imitation of the formula in the Pagan mysteries—(e. g.

*ἐκὰς, ἐκὰς, ὅστις ἀλιτρός,
Procul, O, procul, este profani,*)

that it is impossible to allow its *primitive apostolic* character. The passage is, μήτις τῶν κατηχουμένων, μήτις τῶν ἀμυήτων, μήτις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων ἡμῖν συνδεηθῆναι. Ἀλλήλοις ἐπιγινώτε. Τὰς θύρας. Ὅρθοι πάντες. Ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν. This is such a very close imitation, that no one can mistake it; and those who are desirous of further examples will find this Liturgy in the British Museum, under the title of *Liturgiæ SS. Ap. Basilii, &c.** It may be also seen in Renaudot's Collection and Assemani Codex Liturgicus.

* Also with an English translation, under the title of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem.

The Liturgy, which goes by the name of St. Mark, is also corrupt : and Liturgies are extant which are severally ascribed to St. John, St. Peter, the twelve Apostles, Ignatius, and many more. That on which we have been commenting is supposed, by some, to have been introduced into the Church of Jerusalem about the time of the first Council of Nice : this is, however, unimportant, since it contains intrinsic evidence of not having been written by St. James. Various attempts have been made at expurgation, so as to restore it to its imagined primitive state : for this purpose it has been compared with other Liturgies, such as the Clementine, Basil's, &c., and with Cyril's catechism :—but it is manifest that, however much may be expunged from it, this expurgation will not prove the remaining parts to be authentic. Nor can Cyril's catechism be admitted in proof of any thing beyond the state of the copies in this day.

Let any one read St. Mark's Gospel, then the Liturgy which passes under his name, St. Peter's Epistles, and then the Liturgy which is named from him, and the difference between the inspired compositions and these will be so very apparent as to preclude the necessity of a long argument on the question of authenticity. The apocryphal Gospels would naturally induce an expectation, that there would be also apocryphal liturgies : and if at a very early age apostolical constitutions were invented, why might not apostolical Traditions have been equally forged ? Apocrypha soon became very numerous. From the Greek let the inquirer proceed to the Oriental Liturgies :—if he so proceeds, he will be further convinced of their general apocryphal character. Yet we would not be understood to affirm, that they may not contain parts of primitive service, or to deny that there are many excellent parts in them : but we affirm that these parts cannot be positively ascertained, that the Liturgies were not written by apostles, that the good has already been appropriated by our Church, and that if one of these Liturgies, *as it is*, be compared with our Communion-service, it will be abundantly clear to every unprejudiced person that the desired *improvements* would really be *deteriorations*. These Liturgies may decidedly be enumerated among the *Pseudepigrapha*.

The New Testament leaves an impression on our minds that the Divine services of the primitive Christians were simple ; and what history has recorded to us of the Judaizing-Christians and early heresies is quite sufficient to account for spurious productions given to the world under apostolic names. That Liturgies should exist, as those of Basil, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, is far from surprising us ; for since every bishop had formerly the power of forming a Liturgy for his own diocese, provided he

adhered to the analogy of faith and doctrine, such might naturally be expected to have reached our day :—but having been so formed, and having reached our day, how do they become arguments as to the contents of *primitive Liturgies* ?

Probably on some future occasion we may examine these Liturgies and others, which are in manuscript, more diffusely ; and show that Mr. Froude, in No. 63, and Mr. Palmer, who has been his principal authority, have not rightly judged them. At present, having exceeded our limits, we conclude with a repetition of the Apostle's advice to all, " be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines ;" and the advice of the 43rd Tract, *not to let the noble old Prayer-book be pulled to pieces, just to humour a mob of Tiptops, Gapes, and Yawns.*

ART. II. *A Digest of the Evidence taken before Select Committees of the two Houses of Parliament, appointed to inquire into the State of Ireland ; 1824-1825. With Notes, historical and explanatory and a Copious Index.* By the Rev. WILLIAM PHELAN, B.D., and the Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN, A.M. 2 vols. 8vo. Cadell.

2. *The Achill Mission, and the general State of Protestantism in Ireland ; being the Statement delivered by the Rev. EDWARD NANGLE, at a Meeting of the Protestant Association, held in Exeter Hall, Friday, Dec. 28th, 1838.* London. 8vo. pp. 28. Protestant Association.
3. *Letters from Ireland, MDCCCXXXVII.* By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. 8vo. pp. 436. Seeley and Burnside.
4. *Authentic Reports of the two great Protestant Meetings held at Exeter Hall, London, on Saturday, June 20, and Saturday, July 11, 1835, to prove to Protestants of all denominations, by authentic documents, the real tenets of the Church of Rome, as now held by the Roman Catholic Priests and Bishops of Ireland.* 8vo. pp. 72. Hatchards.
5. *The uses of the Established Church to the Protestantism and Civilization of Ireland.* By J. C. COLQUHOUN, Esq. M.P. 8vo. pp. 20. Hatchards.
6. *Evils of the State of Ireland ; their Causes and their Remedy—a Poor Law.* By JOHN REVANS, London. pp. 152. Hatchards..
7. *Ireland ; its evils traced to their source.* By the Rev. JAMES R. PAGE. 12mo. pp. 172. Seeleys.

8. *Irish Tranquillity under Mr. O'Connell, my Lord Mulgrave, and the Romish Priesthood.* By ANTHONY MEYLER, M.D., M.R.I.A. 12mo. pp. 126. Dublin : Carson.
9. *The Protestant Penny Magazine.* 1 vol. 8vo. Dublin.
10. *The Catholic Directory and Annual Register, for the year 1839.* London. Booker and Dolman.

IT is well known to those who are conversant with the history of the Church of Rome, that there exists in the Papal court a tradition, which, received and to a certain degree acted upon by all who have filled the chair of the Pontificate, has, nevertheless, received the attention, furnished a clue, and given a complexion to the operations of Gregory XVI. to a far greater extent than it did to any of his predecessors:—viz., that the aspect of affairs in Ireland, and the ascendancy or depression of Popery in that island, is of more consequence to the Papacy, and more pregnant with advantageous or disastrous results to the general spread of Romanism, than its position in any other country in Christendom: that the dominancy of the priesthood of Rome over the population of Ireland, or the severance of the galling fetters of Popish superstition in that unhappy country, supplies an undeviating test of the present prosperity or decline, and a certain presage of the future spread or diminution of the power and influence of the Popedom, of the expansion or detrition of the *Regalia Petri*.

The State of Ireland, consequently, exhibits to the Papal court, at the present moment, the very highest possible assurance of the progressive spread of Romanism, and expressive indications of the speedy resuscitation of her supremacy in other countries, in all its vivid and remorseless energy. The operations of Popery in Ireland, and her restless efforts to attain the summit of her lofty claims, are no longer of an inceptive or preliminary description: the mask has gradually been laid aside, much that was esoteric and concealed in the dark hearts of her priestly vassals, has now been exposed to the broad face of day, with consummate audacity and equal abandonment of every claim to moral dignity, or even conventional morality. The formerly disavowed and repudiated designs of Popery are now rendered exoteric without a blush; and, feeling herself strong enough to cast aside her treacherous veil, she assumes, in the sister isle, her old and intolerant garb of claimant for ascendancy. Every clause in the Popish Emancipation Act that contained a supposed or intended security for the Church Establishment has been notoriously violated, and the Romish ecclesiastics, with daily increasing effrontery, usurp the titles of our bishops, and, emboldened by the impu-

nity with which they are permitted to controvert and transgress the law, vie with each other in the frequency of its infringement. We may be pardoned, perhaps, for referring to an interesting and important debate on this subject, which took place in the House of Lords on the 8th of June, 1836.

On a petition being presented from a Romish priest against his archbishop, Lord Lyndhurst adverted to a gross instance of the spirit of Popery—an instance, too, taken not from the rude habits of the peasantry, but from the highest ranks of its ecclesiastics. In passing the Romish bill of 1829, it had been especially stipulated, as a protection to the Established Church, that no Romish bishop should assume the title of any Protestant see. The condition was of obvious necessity, and it was fully accepted. Yet the Popish bishops in Ireland had no sooner obtained the bill, than they assumed the titles of the Protestant sees. Men who had hitherto derived their titles from nominal dioceses at the ends of the earth, Bishops of Mesopotamia, Nova Zembla, Abyssinia, Monomatapa, or Madagascar, now dubbed themselves bishops of every existing see of Ireland, and even the whole Irish Church establishment was partitioned among them without delay. To this violation of compact and law Lord Lyndhurst called the attention of the House :

“ There was one point (said his lordship) which showed *how little regard* was paid to certain restrictions insisted on at the time of passing the act, which at the time was considered and received *as a boon*. By the 29th clause of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, it was provided that no person should assume the title of archbishop of a province, or bishop of a diocese, who was not entitled to do so by the law of the land. That was a point insisted on at the time. Now, on looking over the correspondence connected with this petition, he saw the name of a Roman Catholic as archbishop of a Protestant diocese. It would thus appear that these titles were assumed, *though forbidden by Act of Parliament!*”

Lord Melbourne attempted a feeble reply, that as the Romish religion required bishops, they must have some kind of titles.

The Duke of Wellington, himself the framer of the bill, now rose, strongly observed on the usurpation, and charged this breach of the law on the weakness or negligence of the ministry,

“ The law (said the Duke) had forbidden the adoption of those titles, and had succeeded in preventing the use of them in England, *but had not succeeded in preventing the use of them in Ireland*. The law, the execution of which rested in the hands of noble lords opposite, was thus not at present sufficient to prevent the use of those titles in Ireland. But if they looked to other countries, they would find that those titles were abolished ; and if they looked to this country, they

would see that though there were persons exercising those powers and authorities in the Romish Church, yet that the law in this point had been obeyed. And, in his opinion, *the law ought to be, in like manner, obeyed in Ireland.*"

Lord Melbourne finally admitted that the act forbade the assumption by Roman Catholics of the titles held by the Protestant prelates, and accounted for his mistake by saying, "that he had supposed Lord Lyndhurst's objection applied to their calling themselves archbishops at all." The debate closed with the reception of the petition; but, notwithstanding the Premier's conviction, no order on the subject has gone forth from his council, and the Popish bishops usurp the Protestant titles by their own authority still.

So far as the Popish clergy are personally concerned, the whole transaction is of the most extraordinary kind. To a man of honour or conscience a promise is as binding *as an oath*. They have promised, and, in Lord Lyndhurst's words, promised readily and without remonstrance; they accepted the Relief Bill with all its conditions, and accepted it *as a boon*. This, too, is vouched openly before the world by the man who conducted the whole unhappy business; yet the Popish prelates have, without hesitation or palliation, broken the promise, and persist in breaking it. It is to be observed, as a further evidence, that they have thus broken it *only* in Ireland. If they felt that the assumption was capable of being defended by law or conscience, and was either a matter of concession or a matter of right, who can doubt that they would have asserted their claim here and assumed the titles of the English prelacy! If they call themselves archbishops of sees in Ireland, why not call themselves Archbishops of Canterbury and York in England? But no; they felt that the law had a vigilance in England which slept in wretched Ireland; that in England their personal power was nothing, while in Ireland they had only to domineer at will over a populace enslaved by bigotry, and govern all else by faction. Thus they dared to usurp in Ireland what they have not ventured even to ask for in England. We have remarked on this proceeding as an evidence of the designs of Popery, of its utter incapability of being bound by any compact, and of its *palpable conspiracy to overthrow the Established Church in Ireland*. Let Protestants beware.*

What so likely to engender turbulence and a contempt for

* See a powerful article in *Blackwood's Magazine* for October 1836, on Parliamentary debates.

law in a priest-ridden people as this open and unblushing infringement, by their highest ecclesiastics, of the stipulations of the very act which conceded to them political equality? What so calculated to recommend or enforce (for it amounts to this) the total disregard of British legislation, and the repudiation of British connexion, as this flagrant violation, by the Irish viceroy of the Pope, of the conditions which accompanied the withdrawal of legal prohibitions, and the ample but, alas! too liberal concession of political power?†

But turn we to another matter, equally important and equally

† If there be any among our readers silly enough to imagine that any measure relating to Ireland, short of the total destruction of the Established Church, can check the vigorous system of agitation adopted by Irish demagogues, we think the history of the late Tithe Commutation Act, and the cry so speedily raised against it, will convince him of his folly. The plundering the Church of one-fourth of her property, and taking a million of the public money for the purpose of discharging the legal debts of anti-tithe conspirators, would, it was said, reconcile the people to the payment of the rent-charge. And yet what has been the case? At a meeting of the farmers of Kilmacon, county of Kilkenny, on the 16th of December, 1838, the following resolutions were adopted:—

“ 1st. That we, the undersigned, solemnly declare that we feel a conscientious objection to the payment of tithes, as being a remnant of our slavery; an unjust tax on our property and industry, as being injurious to our religion and insulting to God. 2d. That we consider the man that will enforce tithes an oppressor, determined to perpetuate our slavery, to injure our property, and to insult our holy religion. 3d. That we consider the man that pays tithes (unless he be a Protestant) an enemy to his neighbour, an enemy to his country, an enemy to his religion, and an enemy to his God.”—(*Then follows an immense list of signatures.*)

And how do we find Mr. O’Connell and his Precursors speak of the rent-charge? As a *remnant* of a burden that was to be got rid of as soon as possible:—

“ We received that measure (said Mr. O’Connell) merely as a temporary one, and should not cease our endeavours to procure the total extinction of the impost, on account of having received this instalment. I think it rather a foolish plan not to take five shillings in the pound from an insolvent creditor at any time; but I would always take care never, on any account, to give him a general release for that sum. (*Cheers and laughter.*) We have, then, got five shillings in the pound of our demand; we have struck off £160,000 from the total amount of the tithes, and I therefore do not care what language may be addressed to me on the subject. I do not mean or attempt to excuse myself for my vote on this measure; on the contrary, I put it before

pregnant with solemn warning and material for grave consideration. The violation of the oath taken by Roman Catholics on their admission to the British legislature has been a by-word; and instead of their solemn declarations of peaceful satisfaction

the people of Ireland as one of my merits, and as a motive for their good wishes towards me." (*Loud cheers.*)

The report of the Precursors thus alludes to the same subject :—

"The act has a double aspect. One part is retrospective, and relates to the arrears of tithe composition on or before the 1st day of November last; the other part relates to the period from the 1st November, 1838, prospectively. The retrospective portion of the act relates, of course, to the arrears; the prospective relates to the nature and amount of the sums to be paid in future to the tithe-owners. The tithe composition is prospectively extinguished, and in lieu of it is established a rent-charge, payable in the manner hereinafter mentioned. The change of name from tithe composition to rent-charge is immaterial; but what is very material is, that the rent-charge is in every instance, by one-fourth, less than the tithe composition had hitherto been; so that wherever a tithe-owner heretofore was entitled to £400 a year, he is in future only entitled to £300; and so in proportion for greater or lesser sums. Your committee deem this a fact of considerable importance; it lessens at one blow the burden charged on the people of Ireland for the Protestant clergy and other tithe-owners 25 per cent., causing an alleviation which cannot be estimated at less than £160,000 per annum. It appears to your committee that no person desirous of the extinction of tithes could have voted against a measure so comprehensive for their purposes."

Sir James Graham, at Glasgow, thus speaks of this transaction, while contrasting the solemn asseverations of the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, when seeking for emancipation, with their conduct and practices since that boon was obtained :—

"I am sorry to confess that I stand before you in the situation of a dupe. I did believe that the Catholics would rest satisfied with an equality of civil rights, and that they did not aspire to religious ascendancy or the overthrow of the Protestant Church. I was present under the gallery of the House of Commons, in 1805, when Mr. Fox first moved the consideration of the Catholic claims, and when Mr. Grattan made his first speech in the British Parliament as their most powerful advocate. These speeches made an indelible impression on my mind, and I recollect them as well now as if it were yesterday. Both of them placed the claim of the Catholics to equal rights on the ground that it would give increased security to the Protestant Church; and they both declared that if any danger, in their judgment, were likely to arise to the national church from the concession, they would reject it at once as dangerous. But now the danger is not imaginary—one fact is worth ten thousand vague statements of opinion. Last session we surrendered one-fourth of all the tithes of Ireland, and relieved the Catholic occupier, placing the burden on the Protestant landlord. It

and contentment in the existence of the Protestant Establishment, and strong and vehement abnegations of any intention to subvert or wish for the overthrow or even delapidation of the Church of England and Ireland which accompanied their suppliant whinings for political equality, we have now the periodical crusade of agitation against her temporalities, the bold and unblushing avowal of determined hostility to her rights secured by law, and reiterated affirmations that the entire extermination of a Protestant Church from the Irish soil is the ulterior object in view, and all that falls short of this but a step or instalment to the attainment of that consummation of their bigotry and licentious zeal. In the meantime the whole island, from the centre to the circumference, is annually at least deluged with blatant and declamatory harangues, redolent with seditious sentiments, well calculated to breed disaffection and enkindle the latent flame of blind and furious animosity, and ferocious, headstrong, and unbridled frenzy, in minds darkened by superstition and debased and ground to the dust by the enervating, brutalizing influences of spiritual vassalage.

Popery has been working mightily in Ireland; she knows well that Ireland supplies a fulcrum on which she may rest her lever for the overthrow of English Protestantism with all but a certainty of success. It requires but a meagre stock of discernment to perceive that the destruction of the Church in Ireland would, in all probability, prove but the "precursor" of the demolition of the Church in England; that the downfall of Irish Protestantism would herald in the annihilation of our own Establishment; and, as the harbinger of deeper woe, and a yet more calamitous disaster, be succeeded swiftly by the dissolution of every national religious institution, and the crumbling into dust of every stronghold of British Protestantism.

We do not imagine that it could be possible to invest this question with more than its real importance; or that the attention, unwearied and assiduous, it has met with from every statesman

was said we thereby incurred the risk of making the Protestant proprietors anti-tithe agitators. What has happened? The cry for the total abolition of tithes is raised by the Marquis of Headfort, one of the Queen's Lieutenants in Ireland, and one of the attendants on her royal person. Just think of the noble marquis returning to her Majesty's presence, and resuming his place near the throne of the first Protestant sovereign in Europe—the sworn defender of the faith, with the shouts of acclamation still ringing in his ears which were raised by the Precursors when, at the suggestion of Mr. O'Connell, three cheers were given for the Marquis of Headfort as the grand anti-tithe agitator of Ireland."

worthy the name has been more than equal to the momentous interests involved in its consideration. The merest sciolist in political matters, the man who casts the most superficial glance over passing events and the page of history, who takes the slightest interest in the destinies of countries, and has learned the vowels of his creed, must confess that the state of Ireland, considered in any light, is of gigantic importance, is worthy of the most anxious solicitude and unremitting attention, and may justly demand the most laborious research and study to discover the origin of the multiform evils that distract her, the causes of their development and growth, the line of policy best calculated to prove efficacious in the amelioration of her condition, and the remedies most likely to counteract the baneful workings of the evils that rend her bosom, blight and wither her colossal energies, disperse her domestic tranquillity to the winds, and shiver her resources into fragments. If, instead of internal peace and harmony, we discern nothing but the fermentation of the basest passions that can agitate the human breast; instead of calm and steady industry producing its own reward, we find an inverted order of things, and a starving population wringing a bare pittance from a soil more than commonly enriched by Providence for agricultural purposes; if, instead of satisfaction, we discover discontent; instead of reverence, a reckless contempt, for the laws; instead of truth and honesty between man and man, we find distrust and the total absence of all confidence; instead of protection for property and life we find pillage and murder go unpunished, felons and murderers escape with impunity; and, above all, if we discover below the agitated surface of society a dark and unfathomed gulf of sorrow, wretchedness, misery, and want, whose troubled waves refuse to subside, but heave and swell in eternal and bitter strife and commotion; who shall tell us that we give the subject a meretricious importance, or yield it a degree of consequence to which it has no claim, when we declare that the present state of Ireland requires the closest attention, and calls peremptorily for the most vigorous and energetic measures on the part of all who value their own civil and religious liberties, and have a heart to appreciate the value of morality, religion, and patriotism, whose united and combined necessities imperatively demand the immediate relief and rescue of a betrayed and persecuted Protestantism in Ireland? We think it clear to a demonstration that the grand evil of Ireland is *Popery*; that the remedy for that evil must be found in a pure scriptural faith, in a word, in *Protestantism*; and that the only medium by which that remedy can be communicated to Ireland is the *Established Church*. *Popery*

knows this; she has her hoof upon the Church in Ireland, and it is this that gives her confidence, that administers the cordial to her blood-thirsty persecuting spirit, that induces her to press her advantage to the utmost, and bend all her energies upon consummating her own triumph and the thorough annihilation of Irish Protestantism.

The entire resubmersion of Ireland in papal gloom and darkness, as a necessary preliminary to the further realization of her impious and enormous claims, has for some years been the aim and design of Popery. The whole papal machinery has been put in motion, the entire influence of the court of Rome brought into play, the order of the Jesuits resuscitated, the papal ban against them withdrawn, marks of favour lavished upon them by Gregory XVI., who appears cunning enough to recognise in them the fittest tools for the accomplishment of his ambitious projects, and one universal consentaneous movement commenced which has its mainspring within the walls of the Vatican, and is alike produced, directed, and controlled by the court of Rome; for what? We hesitate not to say, for *the subversion of every Protestant throne in Europe*. There is not a section of Protestant Europe into which the subtle and putrescent agency of the Jesuits has not been introduced; there is not a Protestant court uncursed by the presence of the seditious and revolting leaven of Jesuitry; no political, literary, or commercial coterie without the pestilential intrusion of the disguised follower of Loyola.* The court of Rome appears to be making one grand and comprehensive struggle for the subjugation

* "Ever since their first institution, the Jesuits have proved the most subtle and indefatigable enemies to the reformed faith. Before their expulsion from the several states of the continent, and their formal suppression in 1773 by the virtuous and enlightened Ganganelli, they had multiplied by myriads over Christendom. They were in the sick chamber, in the council chamber, in the guard-room, in the ball-room, in the camp, the court, the servants' hall, the senate, the attorney's office, the sheriff's office, the merchant's office, the prison, on every scene of life, as at the bed of death. Wheresoever minds were to be directed, or arrangements prepared, or acts completed, there were stationed Jesuits on some prescribed, mysterious, and occult mission, the remote and ultimate result of which, although they were qualified to effect, their employers, perhaps, rarely, if ever, enabled them to appreciate.

"This formidable association, though banished from all countries, found means to exist in all. At Rome, where it was suppressed by a bull, within four months of the signature of which bull the Pope who signed it expired, the order flourished through the grave. *Ireland has*

tion of Christendom beneath her own sway, and to bend her energies with most of power and lavish care upon Ireland, as affording at once the key to more extensive acquisitions and the stepping-stone to the re-enthralment of Britain, alike her most successful antagonist and the most illustrious empire of the world.

It would be quite foreign to our present intention to enter into any consideration of the present state of continental powers, or an investigation of the portentous "signs of the times" which crowd the surface of Europe. Suffice it to have drawn attention to the fact, that the agency of Rome is at this very moment insidiously, incipiently, or consummately at work, sapping the foundation of every Protestant throne, infusing its corrosive principles into the fabric of every enlightened constitution and the frame and remote extremities of every Protestant community, instilling its deadly virus into the life's blood of Europe, and blasting, with the mildew of its foetid breath, the domestic peace and the national prosperity of the most illustrious and renowned, because the most Protestant, among European nations.

Our readers have doubtless paid some little attention to the indications of moral idiocy displayed by the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer in his career of headlong fanaticism. There can be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent being that he is on the high road to the attainment of either a "*hat*" or a *strait waistcoat*. Charity compels us to wish he may obtain the latter, though we think he will secure the former. We learn from the public declarations of this unhappy man (unhappy, because deliberately preferring darkness to light, with the full blaze of Revelation shining upon his path) that the Church of Rome is now engaged in offering up universal weekly prayers to the Queen of Heaven and her ten thousand saints for the reversion to Popery of Protestant England! We may look upon this new movement of the Papacy as indicating a similar result with the tiger's lashing his tail. It indubitably furnishes a convincing proof of the truth of what we have advanced, that Popery is exerting herself to the utmost, with the most intense and anxious solicitude, to obtain the restoration of England to her communion

at all times been secretly moved in one direction or another by Jesuits. In England, for almost half a century, they have been erecting colleges and conducting education on an extensive scale, though forbearing cautiously to excite uneasiness. But now they swarm, and buzz, and sting, gaudy as butterflies and fierce as hornets."—*Editor of the Times.*

and maternal bosom. If England is confessedly the principal subject of her intercessions to the Virgin, can we doubt that she is the chief object of her thoughts and operations. And indeed we are broadly informed by Mr. Spencer that *he* and his fellow-slaves of Rome will give *us no rest* till they have accomplished the complete spiritual subjugation of England !

We consider it clear then, from the open declarations of Romish agents and the concurrent testimony of existing circumstances and progressing events, that whatever bustling activity or penetrating subtlety Popery is exerting elsewhere—in Russia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, or France—that England and Ireland engross the most of her care and solicitude ; that on them are lavished, with an unsparing prodigality, her wealth, her ingenuity, and her best trained emissaries ; that every available agency, with consummate tact and zeal, is brought strenuously to bear, in order to entangle them in the meshes of her net and effect their subjugation beneath her baneful dominion.

There was a time when Popery dare not have uttered in England this expression of her designs. But since the fatal measure of 1829 she has made such rapid and fearfully alarming strides that she no longer feels any hesitation in assuming an attitude of hostility to the national institutions of the country, and publicly declaring to Englishmen that she is sedulously forging fetters for their spirits and plying every art for the reimmersion of society in the black and whirling chaos of ancient barbarism. The blasphemy and awful criminality attaching to these frenzied satellites of Rome, who unblushingly prostitute the sacred duty of prayer to a satanic purpose, and offer up intercessions for the re-entailment upon their country of all the horrors of Papal supremacy, the dark and iron re-enactment of popish bans and prohibitions, in a word, the dreary return of an age of gloomy and unmitigated despotism, with its ten thousand attendant evils, is beyond the power of language to portray. Let us

“ Draw o’er the dismal scene soft pity’s veil,”

and earnestly offer up the prayer of David ;

“ Our fathers trusted in thee : they trusted, and thou didst deliver them. They cried unto thee and were delivered : they trusted in thee and were not confounded. Be not thou far from me, O Lord : O my strength, haste thee to help me.* Shew thy marvellous loving-kindness, O thou that savest by thy right hand them which put their trust in thee from those that rise up against them. Keep me as the apple of the eye, hide me under the shadow of thy wings, from the wicked that oppress me, from my deadly enemies, who compass me about.” †

* Psalm xxii. v. 4, 5, 19.

† Psalm xvii. v. 7, 8, 9.

We have had many severe lessons of late years with regard to the insatiable appetite of Popery for pre-eminency and the lording it over Christ's heritage. The amplest toleration is evidently a mere bagatelle in her estimation.

Let us look at the present state of Ireland, if we would learn her moderation. At this moment all power there is in Popish hands: the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, the two law officers of the Viceroy, *are Papists*. The Master of the Rolls and the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Judges whose courts have much to do with church property, *are Papists*. The Lord Chancellor has long been a Roman Catholic advocate. All the new Judges have been made by direct Roman Catholic patronage; all the old Judges confessedly retain their seats simply that they may not be succeeded by Papists. Of the one hundred and five Irish Members, seventy-five are expressly returned by Roman Catholic interest. From the common policeman to the titled puppet who enacts royalty at the Castle, all is Roman Catholic appointment! The Lord Lieutenancy, an office of empty pageantry, is now held by a virtual creature of the Papacy. But Popery is not satisfied with even this; Mr. O'Connell, the parliamentary agent and mouth-piece of the priesthood of Rome in Ireland, to whose influence alone he is indebted for his annual retaining fee as the advocate of the Papacy, *demand*s (for as we have seen before, in the assumption by Papists of the titles pertaining to the Protestant Prelacy, what dare not be suggested in England, is unhesitatingly done in Ireland with every certainty of impunity)—Mr. O'Connell peremptorily demands, and accompanies the demand with a blustering threat, an increase in the number of Irish puppet senators, and the virtual annihilation of Church temporalities in Ireland, with a very transparent and significant appeal to the pikes of two millions of able-bodied fighting Milesians.

In that devoted island, Popery is rapidly consummating the dislocation of society, the articulations and framework of the social system are separating and dissolving in wild commotion, and its elements again reforming in fresh but awfully portentous combinations. The rancorous and malignant spirit of detestation of England and insubordination towards a Protestant Government is kept alive by a base and profligate priesthood, who fling fresh fuel, sabbath after sabbath, to the flames of animosity, and thunder from the altar the vilest denunciations of every thing Protestant, and the most virulent and bitter invectives and vituperations against all who are infected with Protestantism. The priest operates as a mainspring to every outrage upon Protestants.

He launches his anathemas against them by name on the sabbath, and the next day witnesses their assassination or the destruction of their property. Every turbulent fellow who happens, which is not frequently, * to be brought before the bar of justice, is sure of a *good character* from the Priest, provided he be only a Papist: that is quite enough to secure a good word from his reverence. Instances are known of Popish priests speaking strongly to the character of individuals of whom, as has been afterwards elicited by counsel, they were completely ignorant, so much so as not even to know their names.

The confessional, likewise, places in the hands of the priest a potent engine for the corruption of society, of which he is but too ready to avail himself to the utmost. We shall not here again enter into the loathsome and sickening details which have been made public, with respect to the obscenities and blasphemies of the Romish confessional.† It is enough to state the fact, which can at any time, unhappily, be substantiated by but too ample proof, that this rite of the Church of Rome is in Ireland prostituted to the same vile end to which the celebrated Talleyrand, when Abbé de Perigord, boasted that he used it, viz: the moral contamination of females, and the immolation of female chastity upon the altars of putrid sensuality!

But it is as a powerful agency of the Papacy, and not as a medium of gratifying the lusts of a priesthood bound to compulsory celibacy, that we view the confessional as most pregnant with the elements of universal evil to a community, and as utterly at variance with the existence of free institutions or a Protestant constitution. The priest in the confessional is considered by the unenlightened Papist as standing in the place of God to his conscience. The confessional is to him only a means of spiritual *whitewashing*. He goes there to get rid of his crimes, committed and in contemplation. He is certain of obtaining absolution: he pays his money, mumbles his confession, and goes away with a full conviction that his soul is clean; and perpetrates new

* Some idea of the impunity with which Papists are permitted to commit outrages upon the persons of Protestants may be gathered from the fact of their having happened in Achill no less than 23 assaults by Roman Catholics upon Protestants, and in one case only was any inquiry instituted, though the Rev Edward Nangle repeatedly urged the Irish Executive to investigate the matter; and sent complaint upon complaint to the Irish Secretary (Lord Morpeth).

† See an Article upon this subject in *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, No. IV.

enormities with the flattering unction of priestly absolution buoying up his determination, pacifying the voice of conscience, and giving strength to his arm and coolness to his aim, as he deliberately attacks his unconscious victim. This is no exaggeration; the case is continually occurring in Ireland in which men have rushed from the mass-house or confessional to the committal of the most horrifying and inhuman brutalities. Let the reader only refer to the last pamphlet of the Rev. Mr. O'Crolly, formerly a Popish priest, but now, by the mercy of God, a clergyman of the Establishment, and he will find in the vivid and fearful statements of that gentleman, with respect to *his own experience* in the confessional, enough to harrow up his feelings and convince him that the existence of so accursed an institution is incompatible with civil freedom and the wholesome administration of the law. It is well known, moreover, as an historical fact, that the confessional has continually been used for the purpose of *instilling sedition* into the minds of Roman Catholic subjects of a Protestant prince;* that it has proved one of the most powerful and efficient agenda of the Court of Rome in stirring up rebellion, creating and fanning the flames of disaffection and treason, and schooling regicides and traitors for the execution of their dark and satanic plots.

The following extract from the "Digest of Evidence" throws

* For instance, when Henry the Eighth shook off the authority of the Pope, there came a private commission from Rome to the Archbishop of Armagh, to make the people of Ireland swear fealty to the Pope at confession. The oath ran as follows :—

"I, from this present hour forward, in the presence of the Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, of St. Peter and the holy apostles, of the archangels, angels, saints, and of all the holy host of heaven, shall and will be always obedient to the Holy Roman See of St. Peter, to my holy Lord the Pope of Rome and his successors, in all things *spiritual and temporal*, not consenting in the least that his Holiness shall *lose the least title or dignity belonging to the Papacy of our Mother Church of Rome, or to the regality of St. Peter.* I further vow to oppose all heretics either in making or setting forth edicts or commandments contrary to the *Mother Church of Rome.* I count and value all acts made, or to be made, by heretic power, of no force or worth. I do further declare him or her, father or mother, brother or sister, son or daughter, husband or wife, &c. accursed, that either do or shall hold for the time to come, any ecclesiastical or civil power above the authority of the Mother Church," † &c.

† *From Sir James Ware.*

considerable light upon the unavoidable, treasonable, and seditious tendency of the confessional in Ireland.

Rev. J. Doyle, D. D. (Romish Bishop) examined.

“Would a priest think himself justified, in case he received in confession a knowledge of an intended crime, to take any measure by which he could prevent the execution of that crime?—No; he cannot, more than the means he uses with the individuals themselves.

“Could not he warn the person against whom the crime is intended to be committed?—He cannot: we adopt, with regard to the secret of confession, an expression of St. Augustin’s; his latin is very bad, but it expresses our sentiments very strongly: ‘Plus ignorat quod sacerdos a peccatore audit quam quod nescit.’

“Would not such a regulation, were it adopted, defeat its own purpose, as far as connected with the security of the state, by preventing the habit of confession on those subjects?—Altogether; but by leaving it as it is the abuse of it is impossible, because when a criminal comes, if he should come to make his crime known to the priest, the latter endeavours to dissuade him from it, if not perpetrated; and to repair, if it be done, the injury he has committed, as far as it is in his power. If, however, it were once allowed to the priest to reveal the confession, under any circumstances, no criminal would come to him.”

Rev. M. O’Sullivan examined.

“Have you any knowledge of the influence exercised by the Roman Catholic priests in matters concerning the administration of justice?—It appears to me that the system of auricular confession renders the obtaining evidence and discovery of crimes in Ireland much more difficult. The pain of mind attendant on being the confidant of a guilty secret is completely removed by having an opportunity of communicating the secret to a priest in confession; and as he does not make it a condition of absolution that information shall be given of the crime committed, there is a tendency to lessen the people’s regard to justice, and to increase that dislike to the name of an informer which is so generally felt throughout Ireland.

“Have you known any instances of their interference, in which the purposes of justice have been hindered?—A person communicated to me, that having inquired of the priest at confession whether it was criminal to carry on an illicit trade in spirits, the answer was that it was not criminal, and in consequence the trade was continued. My informant was, in my opinion, a person of perfect veracity. It was communicated to me also, that the interference of a priest prevented the discovery of some very important information in the county of Limerick. The person who informed me of the circumstance gave me permission, if necessary, to mention his name: the information was, that a prisoner under sentence of death, had expressed his readiness to give information which might be important to the peace of the country; and while he was speaking in this manner, and ready to communicate his information, the priest came to visit him, the persons to whom

he was about to communicate the information withdrew, and when they returned, the man stated that he had made disclosures to the priest, and it would be for him to disclose what he thought fit, but that he (the prisoner) would not communicate to them any further information."

Rev. James Magavim, D. D. (Romish Bishop) examined.

"Are not the parties who commit a murder generally known to the priest?—I do not think they are.

"Supposing it were stated to him in confession, would he think it consistent with his duty to divulge any part of a communication upon that subject?—He would exert himself to prevent the crime being committed; but any communication made to him in confession is inviolable, he cannot divulge it.

"Supposing it related to a crime not actually perpetrated, but about to be so, in that case is the communication made inviolable?—If a crime is intended, and if it is made known to him in confession only, he cannot divulge; he is to use his influence with the individual, so far as he can, to prevent the crime being committed; but what he hears in the way of confession is inviolable.

"Would he be authorised to give notice to the party whose life might be in danger?—No, I think not; we believe it is of divine institution, as such, inviolable in its secrecy.

"Might he not disclose so much of it as would prevent the perpetration of the crime, without committing the person who had made the confession?—He could not divulge any part of it: it is his duty to prevent, as far as he can, the crime."

"A priest would not make it a condition of absolution that information should be given to a magistrate, and this, although the case may be one of those in which the law of the land regards concealment of the crime as a capital offence. The priest would not command information to be given, because it is alleged the character of an informer is so odious in Ireland as to endanger the life of him who bears it. It is a question of some interest, whether the character of an informer could continue odious, if penitents were instructed to do what the law requires; and it is also a question, whether such a character could be accounted base, if there were no institution, like the confessional, to interpose between the law and the people, and to give the troubled mind an opportunity of obtaining all the comforts of religion, while it retained its purpose of being disobedient towards the state. Every one can understand what a heavy burthen it is to bear the consciousness of crime, how distressing it is to be the confidant of a guilty secret; but in Ireland, among the Roman Catholics, that pain is not understood, because a ready mean is applied to free the conscience, and to disembarass the labouring mind. Thus, then, public opinion becomes more decidedly opposed to the law, and corrupt motives are attributed to the act of giving public information of a crime, because the pain of mind in which such an act might naturally originate is little felt or understood. But if the penitent had not the means of unloading his breast which are afforded him in confession, the principles of human nature would act

upon him according to the ordinary laws, and the result must be salutary to society and public morals. In like manner, it is evident that if throughout Ireland the priests directed that the penitent should communicate his knowledge of hidden crimes to the proper legal authorities (unless the Church of Rome relies upon a very unhappy foundation), the consequence to be expected is that the character of an informer would cease to be so odious as it is at present esteemed, and those abominable confederacies which make treason more formidable than the law would be broken up. From considerations like these it naturally follows, that, in order to have proper laws enacted for the government of Ireland, the legislators should take into account that they are not to contemplate as their object the principles of human nature; but these principles warped, and modified, and counteracted by the agency of an institution over which the legislators have no controul; and as the priests are still to retain their privileges, Ireland should no longer be governed by laws which were constructed on the principle that no such privileges could interfere to defeat their operation.

“The truth is, however, that the great objection to the system of confession (politically considered) in Ireland is, that it familiarises the minds of Roman Catholics to the notion that *their Church is opposed to the established government*. A man confesses a crime, or his knowledge of a crime, for his concealment of which the state would inflict capital punishment upon him; and yet, while he is thus guilty in the sight of the law, the priest desires him to depart in peace, and assures him that he is guiltless before God and the Church! Thus the penitent is taught that however prudent it may be to respect the law, yet it is only where his Church defines sin that he is to feel his conscience bound.

“Whether the instructions and exhortations delivered during the confession have any more direct tendency to confirm such a notion need not be considered here; sufficient information on the subject has been given, when a Roman Catholic bishop declared that a man who was guilty of a capital offence, or, rather, who was in the actual commission of a capital offence against the law of the land, would be, while determined to commit the crime, absolved by the priest. A man who declared his intention to commit a murder would not be absolved; but absolution would not be withheld from the person who declared his intention to conceal his knowledge of murder or treason; and thus Roman Catholics are instructed in the confessional, that the priests do not consider the mere act of disobedience to the state in the light of a sin: is it wonderful, therefore, that with all the remembrances which cling around the peasantry of Ireland, this instruction from the priest should impede the growth of a constitutional feeling among them, and should render the character of an informer odious?”

Let confession, then, be regarded not so much with reference to the secrecy which may be its proper accompaniment, as to the conditions upon which absolution is granted; and when it is found that *to disobey a priest* is represented as *deserving of damnation*, and that *concealment of treason* is not taught to be a sin, let it be

judged whether the Church which trains up its members in such a belief is not (as far as it can safely exercise its power) communicating principles of disloyalty, *and making preparations for rebellion?* Is it too much to affirm that the mere existence in active play of *such* an institution is palpably at variance with all that is lovely in the attributes of national independence, controverts and effectually nullifies the legitimate influence of law, casts contempt upon government authority, and scatters the seed of disaffection and treason upon the prolific surface of Irish society? Who, in truth, can wonder that the state of Ireland should be "volcanic," when they give due consideration to the fact of there being in active operation throughout every section of the island this stimulating hot-bed of disloyalty, this incentive to the reckless disregard of all requirements human and divine, this plentiful source and fosterer of turbulence and crime, and generative fountain from whence flows, in a broad and mighty torrent, the stream of priestly absolution, alike deadening the conscience of the people and bursting the flood-gates of restraint, deluging the land with brutal vice and wickedness.

The recent melancholy end of the Earl of Norbury is a sad but convincing testimony to the truth of what we have stated with regard to the insecurity of life and the entire prostration of the power of law in Ireland. The able and very forcible remarks of one of the first political writers of the day upon the receipt of the painful intelligence are so thoroughly in accordance with our own sentiments, and take so clear and comprehensive a view of the real position of the sister isle, that we shall take the liberty of transferring them to our pages. The Editor of the *Times* newspaper, in his leading article of January the 5th, in alluding to the assassination of Lord Norbury, says:—

"The present state of Ireland is such as would render a single day unstained by capital crime the most remarkable of all occurrences. Obedience to the law by Irishmen, of whatever denomination, has been so often punished with death by those who felt an interest in the breach of it, that violence, instead of law, is the power most dreaded in that country by the multitude; and that duty is despised, because the discharge of it has been left wholly without protection. The creatures of the Castle exclaim that the country never was so 'tranquil' as now. To be sure it is 'tranquil,' but in their sense only: in every other it is the reverse—a reign of terror and a field of blood. The agitators, who know their business, and who wallow in the foul patronage from which all good and loyal subjects of the Crown of England are excluded, have issued explicit orders to their dupes—hate the law, abhor the Protestant, threaten your landlords, drink deep of sedition, murder as many individuals as you please, prepare yourselves for a 'general and

bloody rebellion' as soon as, *but not until*, the QUEEN shall be compelled by the people of England to dismiss these creatures of ours whom we support in office and in Parliament for the sake of the public plunder we extort from them. * * In the meantime, how is the mind of the poorer population educated? Unhappily, to nought but evil. The most malignant and most desolating passions are actually inculcated and encouraged among the Roman Catholic people by the demagogues of the Royal Exchange and by the priesthood from the altar. Distrust and animosity towards the upper classes of their countrymen, rancorous hostility towards the people of England, contempt for the Imperial Parliament, eager, though vague and chimerical impatience for a parliament in College-green, vengeance against Protestants and longing desires for a re-confiscation of lands transferred from defeated rebels in past centuries; such are the seeds of convulsion and confusion diligently planted in the prolific spirits of the poor Irish Roman Catholics by men who wind up with the farcical flourish, 'but mind, I warn you, don't dare to violate the law.' Why, every syllable uttered by the agitator is a direct incentive to outrage all the laws of God and man, save and except the single one which would bring the perpetrators into direct collision with the government, by means of *open rebellion in arms*. Every law which ought to secure property is violated every hour; every law which ought to protect life is set at defiance, and savage murders, counted by the score, are committed without the decency of darkness to shroud them. But still the one guilt of insurrection is dexterously evaded. * * The peasantry are taught that hatred of the laws, and of the British government, and of the magistracy, and of the aristocracy, and of the union with Great Britain, is a cardinal virtue. * * They are taught that the first exercise of the Royal prerogative in its most constitutional form, viz.: the selection of other Ministers but those who have gorged the agitator's own minions with plunder, is to be the signal 'for a general and bloody rebellion throughout the land.' Ay, and so reminded by one of their own Romish archbishops."

This is altogether a fearful and terrific aspect of affairs; but it is thoroughly borne out by every one of the volumes which head this article, as well as by columns of recorded outrages which every post brings across the Irish Channel. The following is the testimony of Mr. Nangle, no incompetent witness, let it be remembered, with regard to the spirit of the Church of Rome, the nefarious ends for which the confessional is employed, and the complete impotency of the law in Ireland. We beg the particular attention of our readers to the extract:—

"Force and cruelty are the means which the Church of Rome employs for maintaining her dominion over the minds and consciences of men. Reasoning and persuasion may at first be tried, but when these fail, violence, if circumstances permit, is always employed. 'Whosoever shall affirm,' decreed the Council of Trent, 'that * * * * all Christians, of both sexes, are not bound to observe the same (con-

fession to a priest) once a year, according to the constitution of the great Lateran council, let him be accursed.' Nor is this enactment one of those obsolete barbarisms of the dark ages, which our modern advocates of Popery would persuade us, has fallen into desuetude in the light and intelligence of the 19th century. In the Popish districts of Ireland each parish priest keeps a roll of the inhabitants of every village and every hovel in the parish : at certain periods he attends in each of those villages for the purpose of hearing confessions. If any absent themselves they are immediately suspected of disaffection to the Church. If a Bible-school has been established in the neighbourhood, or if any operations are in progress for the extension of scriptural knowledge among the adult population, the priest does not fail to use his influence in the confessional, to check the progress of light, and to ascertain whether any of his flock have drank at the stream of knowledge, or acquired an appetite for it ; for this purpose it is diligently inculcated on the people that the concealment of any act of disobedience to the Church in confession is a sin of the deepest dye, depriving their souls of the benefit of absolution, and plunging them into the guilt of sacrilege ! Notwithstanding this, the poor Irish do not fail to exercise their national ingenuity in eluding the priest's vigilance in the confessional. Though they are taught to regard the priest in the tribunal of penance as God himself, they frequently endeavour to deceive him. We have known an Irish peasant to remove a Bible from his house the day before he went to confession, with the purpose of taking it back when the confession was over, in order that when questioned by the priest as to whether he had been reading the Bible, he might baffle the enquiry by telling him, 'that he had no such book in his house !' The priests themselves being suspicious lest the duplicity in which they have schooled the people should be thus turned against themselves, do not depend exclusively on the confessional for supplying them with accurate information as to the state of mind of their parishioners. They employ the more devout and obsequious portion of their flocks in the honourable office of spies. The most efficient persons in this capacity are the confraternity-men—individuals who have bound themselves together by a vow to perform certain superstitious observances, and who are distinguished by wearing a scapular, or some other amulet. This trumpery they purchase from the priest, and they also swell his income by paying him additional fees for monthly confessions. Other Governments maintain their police at a heavy cost, but the depth of the Romish policy is such that their most efficient police are tributary to the despotism which receives the benefit of their services. In addition to these auxiliaries, the priest has always ready at his beck a number of lawless, turbulent fellows, who, when the signal is given, destroy the property or injure the persons of those whom the Church has marked for vengeance. The former class of auxiliaries are held in subjection to the priest by a superstitious awe of his authority, and an unquestioning persuasion of his interest in the spiritual world ; in a word, by a firm belief that he is able to save or damn whom he pleases. But the latter class are retained under his banner rather by the spirit of party

and the love of mischief. They also, in the present order of things, find the influence of the priest with the Magistracy and the Government, very useful in extricating them from scrapes into which they frequently fall in the indulgence of their lawless propensities. There is a third class of Roman Catholics in Ireland quite distinct from the two former. They have but little scriptural knowledge, yet the weak light which they enjoy enables them to see that the murderous violence of the priests against zealous Protestants, and their insatiable rapacity in exacting money from their own flocks, render their high spiritual assumptions very questionable. The change which the Church of Rome has made in the recollection of the present generation, in her holy-days and fast-days, has also helped, in connection with friendly controversy with faithful Protestants, to induce a secret suspicion of the antiquity and truth of Popery. These persons are well disposed to attend the preaching of the Gospel, and to send their children to scriptural schools; but they dare not do either the one or the other. If an individual is courageous enough to break bounds in these matters, he is immediately reported to the priest by the confraternity-men. First he is expostulated with. The shame and disgrace which await the turncoat are set vividly before him; then the varied inconvenience and loss which he must sustain in the forfeiture of the good-will of his neighbours are brought forward in dismal and discouraging array. If this fail, the priest incites his nearest relations to add their influence to his persuasions and threats. Should he still continue refractory, the priest calls him out by name in the chapel, invoking the curse of God, and the curse of the saints, and the curse of the congregation upon him. Nor is this all, the priest even reports the name of the devoted delinquent to his brother priests of the surrounding parishes, by whom he is also denounced from their altars, and thus the concentrated bigotry and party spirit of a whole district is directed against one devoted wretch. If he still remain contumacious, his wife and children are exhorted to forsake him, his friends and relations are forbidden to speak to him or show him any kindness, and if the bludgeon or the bullet of the assassin does not hurry him to an untimely grave, he is exposed to a constant fretting and harassing persecution more intolerable than death itself. In these distressing circumstances the victim of Romish intolerance can derive little aid from an appeal to the laws of his country. Jurors who try criminal cases at the quarter sessions and assizes are generally selected from a class over which the Romish priest has unbounded influence. In the estimation of such persons the expressed will of an ecclesiastic divests perjury of its guilt, and through their instrumentality, Trial by Jury, the boasted Palladium of British liberty, is changed into an instrument of oppression!"

After enumerating many outrages committed, at the dictation of the Popish priest on himself, his family, and his little band of Protestants, Mr. Nangle adds,

"But the people are not only encouraged to assault our converts, but they are commanded to withdraw from them the common courtesies

and charities of life. They are forbidden to admit them into their houses, to buy or sell with them, or even to speak to them. In consequence of these unchristian and inhuman commands, our poor people and their pastors are hooted after and insulted wherever they appear, the most provoking epithets, such as 'Jumper and Devil' are liberally bestowed upon them; and it is worthy of remark, that the brother of one priest and the sister of the other, with a vagrant well known to the neighbouring magistrates as a perjurer, and to the people of Achill as the priest's confidential agent—take the lead in this tormenting persecution. But our poor people endure more substantial injuries than this—they cannot procure the necessaries of life from their neighbours. None dare to sell them a morsel of food, except in the concealment of night, for the priests' spies would report the transgression, and the priests' police would avenge it. When persons came from a distant place to sell provisions, the police forbade them to supply the Jumpers (as converts from Popery are called), and even obliged them to put to sea again and carry off their cargo. I have known the convert from Popery, in more cases than one, to have been turned out of a house of public entertainment, in which he sought shelter from the drenching rain and the piercing blast of an October night, the host pleading the command of the priest for conduct so much at variance with our national hospitality. I have seen the husband refusing to speak to a faithful and affectionate wife, and ultimately forsaking her, because she had left the Church of Rome, and joined the proscribed flock of Jesus. I can name the father who was publicly cursed by the priest because he refused to deny the shelter of his roof to an only son who was chargeable with no offence but that of having become a Protestant. I can tell you of mothers who were denied the privilege of purchasing the drink which they required to cool the burning tongues of their children when lying in a fever, because the priest had cursed them. Englishmen, fostered amid the charities of scriptural Christianity, and beguiled by the fair words and smooth speeches of lying Jesuits, who flatter and cajole, because they are not strong enough to oppress and persecute, know little of the true genius of Popery. I say of Popery, because I trace to the fountain of that corrupt system all those bitter streams which poison the waters of society in my native country. I stand not here as the accuser of Irishmen. I testify that our countrymen are generous, kind, and warm-hearted, patient under suffering, and ready to requite every little kindness with an ample return of gratitude. I attribute not the injustice and oppression with which I have been treated through their instrumentality to any peculiar depravity in them. The root of our grievances is not Hibernian—it is a thing of foreign importation—it has come from Rome. Rome has framed the engine of persecution—and the spiritual influence of the Romish priesthood, that harmless thing, as our Liberals represent it, is the steam which keeps the ponderous machinery in incessant motion.*

* The following extracts from the evidence of witnesses examined by a select Committee of the House of Lords on the Irish Education

Mr. Page for some years an active Protestant curate in the Diocese of Tuam, in his interesting little volume, says,

“ When offering a statement of the various means by which Popery

question in the summer of 1837, abundantly attest the accuracy of Mr. Nangle's statement :—

“ Thomas Ralph examined. You went to the chapel where the people were ?—Yes. Did you see Dr. M'Hale in the chapel ?—I did. Did you see Mr. Conolly in the chapel ?—I did. Did you see the other priests of the island in the chapel ?—I believe he had a curate : I think he was there. Did you hear Mr. Conolly preach or say any thing in the chapel ?—I did. Did you hear him say anything concerning the Protestant religion ?—I did. What did he say ?—For one thing he said, that the Protestant religion began in hell and that it would end in hell. Did he say anything about the salvation of Protestants ?—No ; I did not hear him say anything about that. Did he say whether they would be finally lost or not ?—That was what he was about : what he was saying was, that that religion had no foundation—that it was new religion from the time of Luther, and that it began in hell and would end in hell. Did he say anything that meant that persons who belonged to the Protestant religion would go to hell or not ?—Yes, he did say that they would go to hell ; and before I left the Church of Rome, I often heard that said by priests. Did he say anything about persons who worked for the Protestant settlement ?—He did. What did he say ?—He was blaming the people for going to work there, and represented them as one going before the devil, and the devil having two half-crowns on his two horns, and that the man that would go to work there was just completely equal to the man that would take down the half-crowns from the devil's horns and fall down and worship him, or thank him. Did he say that as a reason to deter people from working at the Protestant settlement ?—He did ; that is my opinion. Did it appear to you at the time, clearly that that was his meaning ?—Yes, I know it was. Did he at the same time forbid persons to sell to the Protestant settlement ?—Yes, he did ; he told them not to have any communication with them, not to buy or sell, or even speak a word with them. Did you hear him say that ?—I did. Did Mr. M'Hale say any thing when his sermon was over ?—He got up, and it seemed to me that he confirmed this, or approved of what he heard, in some words that I cannot recollect now. He got up and signified his approval ?—Yes.” Thomas M'Nulty examined : “ Were you a Roman Catholic when you came to Achill ?—I was. Were you ever in the chapel of Ducanally, in Achill ?—I was. Who was the priest that officiated when you went there ?—The Rev. Mr. Conolly. Do you recollect any advice he gave to the people at that time ?—Yes, I do. Was it in his sermon ?—Yes. What did he say ?—He gave orders to his congregation, that any person, Protestant, or reader from the settlement, who would come to them to the field where they were at work, whatever they would have in their hand, if it was a spade, to

has laid waste, and continues the desolation of Ireland, I shall not dwell upon, but only allude to, this argument. That, taking the mind of God from his word, He never can smile upon a land where, in defiance of the pure light of the Gospel, popish idolatry is set up and cherished. This few will admit, for while God's church is a little, sometimes hidden, flock, Popery sits as a queen, and the greater number of men pay her homage.

‘The Babylonian whore hath built
A dome where flaunts she in such glorious sheen,
That men forget the blood which she hath spilt,
And bow the knee to pomp that loves to varnish guilt.’

“But, though many deny, yet I fear not to maintain the proposition. When Jeroboam set up the ‘golden calves,’ and wrested the sceptre from the House of David, God sent the sword, sedition, famine, and pestilence. These were all sent from God to punish the people for having set up and supported idolatry. Ahab would have charged the man of God with the troubles of the land. ‘Art thou he that troubleth Israel?’ said he to Elijah. And he answered, ‘I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.’ Popery has set up idolatry far surpassing that of Ahab. She has also wrested the sceptre from the Son of David, having taken the salvation of sinners out of the hands of Christ, and placed it in those of her own priests. Have we then any reason to expect that God can smile upon a country, that, false to its profession and vows, fosters a system which can only be established upon the ruins of the kingdom of his dear Son? But let us pass on, and bring forward some of those things which I have seen and heard, to show the many ways by which Popery is accomplishing the ruin of Ireland. I shall arrange them under the following heads, and treat of each in order: *First.* She works the evil by dividing the interests of the landlord and tenant, of the people and their best friends and neighbours, and by breaking the ties which should bind them together. *Secondly.* By degrading the minds and bodies of the people, and thereby rendering them incapable of exertion, and unfit for industry. *Thirdly.* By the great incomes of the parish priests, and also by the exactions of their curates; by the levies of the many other priests, friars, miracle-workers, professors of holy wells, and all this tribe of unprincipled impostors; and by the sums raised for political and seditious purposes.”

And then follows a mass of authentic facts, illustrative and

strike them with it; and he likewise told them if they went to their houses, if it was a pitchfork they had in their hands to stick them. In this sermon that you heard, did Mr. Conolly say anything about a man named Murray?—He did. He said to his congregation, ‘You dirty set, I am tired of you: to see that devil, Murray, going about like a wasp, having a sting in his mouth, just to sting the people; a man that was hunted and hooted out of every place that ever he was in, until he came into the borough, and there he is.’”

corroborative of these positions, all of which appear to have come beneath Mr. Page's own observation, and to be valuable and striking, as exhibiting in strong colours the flagitious profligacy of the priesthood, and the demoralizing, impoverishing, and destructive tendencies of Irish Romanism.

The following anecdote from the *Protestant Penny Magazine* will however serve to shew that the debauchery of the priest does not destroy the reverential awe with which his hoodwinked congregation regard him:—

“There lived in the parish a priest, named Father W——d: this man was a notorious drunkard, but this did not diminish his sanctity or power in the judgment of the people. This may seem incredible to some, but one of the villagers assured the writer that he and his fellow-villagers considered the drunken clergy the best of them: ‘And,’ said he, ‘when we go to a priest to get him to read an office, we always bring a bottle of whiskey along with us, and we will be flattering him to take a reasonable allowance, for we think he would not have spirit to do the business *cleverly* unless he had a good share taken.’ ”

The Irish population appear indeed to be immersed in the most profound ignorance. The debasing superstitions, the grovelling ideas, the absurd and charlatanical mummeries, the silly and childish legends which are rife and rank in that distracted country, attest the utter prostration of the human intellect, and the total depression of the national mind beneath the deadly and benumbing influence of Popish despotism. What will our readers think of the following?—

“A scripture reader, known to Mr. Page, was explaining to the poor that God was before all things, when a woman present very gravely demanded how that could be, ‘for sure the Mother of God must be older than God himself?’ ”

Let it be remembered that, according to the Roman Catholic Directory for the year 1839, there are in Ireland no less than two thousand four hundred and fifty one priests of the Church of Rome actively engaged in preaching and inculcating the idolatrous, anti-social, and demoralizing principles of Popery, tightening and riveting the chains of superstition and disloyalty upon a naturally warm-hearted and excitable people.

Let us now turn to the interesting and highly creditable performance of a female writer upon the state of Ireland. Mrs. Phelan, whose writings are always welcome, and who possesses, in a far higher degree than any of her sex, the capability of rendering everything she touches with her pen productive of combined pleasure and edification, and is richly endowed with the faculties requisite for the efficient discharge of the import-

ant duty of inculcating sound principles and conveying accurate information, in a popular and easy style, thus speaks of Popery in her second letter from Ireland :—

“ If it can be shown by incontestible proof, that there is one system exceedingly abhorrent to all that God enjoins, opposing and exalting itself above Christ, usurping his exclusive prerogative of a Priest upon his throne, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, and those too stamped in the Holy Scriptures with the awful character ‘ Doctrines of Devils ;’ if there be a power that reckons among the staple commodities of its merchandize ‘ Souls of men ;’ destroying them by assuming to dispense at its own sovereign pleasure what none can receive but as the free gift of Him who bought both it and them at the costly price of his own blood ;—if this usurping and malignant power be clearly defined in God’s word, branded with a name that expresses a direct and total contrariety to Christ and his gospel, and expressly marked for a final destruction distinct from all other visitations of the divine vengeance, while the only way of escape from that impending doom is opened to its subjects in a proclamation from heaven, ‘ Come out of her, my people ; be ye not partakers of her sins, that ye receive not of her plagues ;’ then, I say, that whatsoever tends to strengthen the position of this adversary, to extend, confirm, or even to sanction the authority already usurped over any part of God’s heritage, or to shade off the broad black line of demarcation laid down by the inspired penmen, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,—I say that it is an act of deliberate rebellion against the Most High ; an open attempt to prevent the kingdoms of this world from becoming the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ. These are my principles, that is to say, faith ; not acquired by associating with any particular set of men, but built on the immutable word of God. *Politics and religion !* what an idle distinction. It is as though on meeting you, instead of the simple salutation of ‘ I am glad to see you,’ I were to say, ‘ I am glad to see your body and soul.’ To be sure the thing is understood ; for I should be grieved to see your body without the soul, well knowing that it must then be rapidly approaching the loathesome corruption of the grave ; but while I behold it living and thriving, I know that the soul is there, and the union complete. The soul will outlive the body, as spiritual religion will outlive the body politic ; but as well might your mortal frame perform the functions of an animated and intelligent being, while your soul was carried away into Abraham’s bosom, as the governing organs of a people on whom the light of revelation has shone, can act and prosper in the absence of that great mainspring of vitality—Christian principle.”

Mrs. Phelan then proceeds to express her own clear and capacious views on that stiffly contested point, *the origin of Irish evils*. Her language and reasoning are both alike admirable, and while she unhesitatingly declares that the *culpable neglect of the poor* is the prolific hot-bed from whence those evils emanate,

and that without a permanent, legalized, sufficient provision, on the plan of a poor law enactment, nothing whatever will be done to improve the general state of Ireland; she asserts, with equal candour, that it is her decided and deeply-rooted conviction, that “the most ample supply of all their temporal need will be *inefficacious, while their minds remain under the baneful influence of Popery.*”

“It is idle,” adds Mrs. Phelan, “to argue the contrary, from the fact of some continental nations presenting a picture of tranquil industry and comparative prosperity, while still in bondage to the see of Rome: they are not subjects of an essentially Protestant state; nor is it the interest of the priests *to encourage disaffection to their respective governments.* If it were so, the history of the world, from the first rise of the papal kingdom to this time, furnishes proof that they would speedily find a pretext for exciting the people. The cruel, shameful neglect, that allows the Irish peasant to perish in utter destitution, is indeed a powerful weapon in the hands of his misleaders; but, *were that removed,* so long as the high places of the state, the revenues of the church, the magisterial and military power, are not lodged exclusively with themselves, so long will those whose influence governs the popular mass, both of mind and matter, in this country, *be movers of sedition.* Trust me, *while Mordecai sits in the gate, his ancient enemy, Haman, who abhors his race, will disregard with sullen unthankfulness all the favours, all the privileges, that can be heaped upon him, and go to his house heavy and displeased.*”

We could cull passage after passage from this truly valuable volume, corroborative of the position we have laid down that the pregnant source of Ireland's misery is emphatically “Popery,” and illustrative of the fact that every nerve is now stretched by Rome to grasp Ireland as her own. The work throughout teems with fine development of the purest patriotism, and glowing sentiments of philanthropy and cordial sympathy with a generous and afflicted people. Mrs. Phelan is unquestionably the most graceful female writer of the day, and manages to fling an attractive charm over every topic that passes beneath the magic influence of her pen. There is a vividness and fire about her writings which irresistibly infuses vigour and animation into the mind of the reader, and generates an absorbing interest in the subject upon which she dwells. Her soul is evidently engrossed in her labours, and she pours forth the gushing feelings of her heart with an earnestness and impetuosity that indicate the intensity of her love for unhappy Ireland, the fervour of her piety, and the regardless integrity and boldness of her devoted spirit. We feel proud of the opportunity of recording our admiration of the talents with which she has been prodigally favoured, and our appreciation of the important labours in which

she is engaged. There can be no finer sight on earth than the voluntary oblation of exalted powers at the shrine of religion. The laborious, and in many respects irksome and unthankful character of the sphere of christian exertion in which the amiable authoress of the *Letters from Ireland* is engaged, can alone be understood by those who are themselves employed in similar occupations. We do not hesitate to declare our sober conviction that since the death of the lamented Hannah More, no christian lady has exerted so salutary and extensive an influence upon that most influential portion of the religious community, the female population of Great Britain, as Mrs. Phelan; neither has any lady ever patiently struggled through more perplexing adversities, or successfully contended against so many adverse and discouraging circumstances. Long, very long, may she continue to delight and edify the thousands who greedily devour her chaste and elegant compositions; long, very long, may she be spared, the brightest female ornament of the literary world, and the effulgent dispenser of light and heat to the myriads of hearts that throb with ecstasy at the mention of the name of Ireland, and burn with irrepressible indignation at the recital of her thousand wrongs!

With but one more extract from her volume, the perusal of which has given us more than ordinary gratification, we will bid adieu to this warm-hearted friend of Ireland and zealous antagonist of Popery, the root of all her evils:

"Whatever tends," writes Mrs. Phelan, *"to rivet the fetter of Papal domination on the necks of the Irish poor, builds a barrier against every species of improvement. No man in his senses can affect blindness to the fact that the church of Rome is straining every nerve to recover her former footing in this country; that is, to reign as she did for some centuries previous to the Reformation, to enjoy unreservedly the ancient church lands and revenues, and to replace the forfeited estates in the hands of her most devoted lay members. You may question this in England, but in Ireland you cannot. The thing stares you in the face through all gradations of proof; you see it in the ostentatious magnificence of the costly mass-house, far outvying the Protestant cathedrals, while the pompous insignia of men openly assuming the title of Bishops, glitters in the noonday sun; in the lofty gait, the vaunting air, the spruce attire, and the sidelong glance of contemptuous defiance, that prove the man who crosses your path to be a priest of Rome; and in its lowest demonstration, in the insolent stare, or slinking avoidance of the poor labourer who does not touch the hat, or utter the respectful salutation that he would have formerly crossed the road to tender, with all the profuse courtesy of his race. That the priesthood of the Romish church, instructed by the hierarchy, are training the people to even more than their former subserviency, is evident beyond contradiction: and unless the leopard has changed his spots, the past holds forth a dark augury for the future."*

Let us now turn to the testimony of Dr. Meyler :—

“ The excitement, now so industriously and so fearfully kept up in Ireland, is not caused by any political feeling in the ordinary and more respectable classes of society ; there is no principle whatsoever of civil liberty mixed up with it—it is not even a contest between the Tory and the Liberal—it is *a warfare against Protestantism and the connexion with England*, carried on by the peasant at the instigation of the priest. The Popish clergy are the real and the only excitors of the rebellious and lawless feelings now so prevalent ; the people, if left to themselves, would be tranquil, and would remain deaf to the voice of the agitator, if it were not re-echoed by the voice of the priests : they are the only effective agitators, and their power is obtained by the agency of superstition. They openly denounce tithes from their altars, and not only advise the people not to pay them, but in all their speeches, either at aggregate meetings, or from the rostrums of their mass-houses, *they excite the people to hatred against England and her religion*. They are unceasing in their efforts to establish the dominion of their mode of worship—*nothing but the full possession of the privileges and emoluments of the Established Church will satisfy them*, and they must be temporal as well as spiritual despots also.”

We hear a great deal of the boast of tranquillity which Lord Normanby's government has effected in Ireland ; but the daily accounts that reach us from that distracted land, of outrage and murder, have rendered the “ *Mulgrave tranquillity* ” a scoff and a by-word of derision. At no period were revolutionary principles so prevalent and so openly avowed ; at no period was hostility to England so sedulously inculcated ; and at no period did the country exhibit so frightful an aspect of disorganization, of lawlessness, and of crime. Every effort is made, on the part of the government, to conceal the real extent of the enormities committed ; and Mr. O'Connell and the priests, now that the Castle seems to be under their dominion, endeavour to preserve the semblance of a hollow and treacherous tranquillity—to hold the peasant as the slip holds the blood-hound, till it is time to loose him at his prey. But their efforts are in vain ; the excitement which both parties feel it essential to keep up, for the attainment of their respective objects, defies even the semblance of tranquillity ; and the frightful scenes of bloodshed and violence with which the press daily teems, are as the showers of ashes from the crater which proclaims the fire that rages within, and which, if Providence prevent not, may herald the overwhelming eruption that is to follow.

The country never was in so deplorable a condition ; ribbon societies are more general and more regularly organized, and outrage, intimidation, and murder, prevail in every part of the country. The country gentleman dares not avow or act on his opinion ; he must at least be passive, or abandon his re-

sidence ; he is no longer a free agent, he possesses neither freedom of action nor even of opinion. The landlord does not receive his rent, nor the minister his tithe, they go to swell the "*Rent*" which Mr. O'Connell levies from the country, as a reward for mischievously disturbing it, and to the priest, as his instigator and co-partner in the work of revolutionary agitation. The landlord himself lives in fear and in danger ; and the peasant is virtually his master : he dictates to him the steward he is to employ, the labourer he is to hire, the rent he is to charge for his land, and the tenant that is to occupy it : should any of these demands be refused, the harvest is not gathered in, or frequently it is trampled down and destroyed ; the cattle are houghed, and the haggard, the barn, perhaps the dwelling-house itself, is consumed ! If a disorderly servant is dismissed, if an insolvent tenant be made to give place to another, should the landlord look for a more advantageous letting of his ground, threats of violence and assassination are proclaimed in the most public manner, written notices are posted up, public rumour echoes the threat, and the victim selected for destruction is either publicly murdered in the open day, or his house is attacked at night, and himself, and probably his whole family, brutally beaten and butchered.

The election of members of Parliameut is no longer free ; the legitimate influence of the landed proprietors and of the resident gentry has ceased. Perjury and intimidation preside over the elections ; the hustings are surrounded by a lawless and ferocious rabble, who infest and impede its approaches ; the candidate who bids highest in the mart of sedition, and bows lowest to the priest, is sure to be returned. One of their prelates, in the exuberant effrontery of his overweening arrogance, has boasted that they could return a cow-boy for any county in Ireland ! Woe to the Roman Catholic, whatsoever his rank or station may be, who dares to vote in opposition to the priestly mandate ; the secret whisper is sent forth, or the terrors of the church are openly arrayed against him : he is denounced from the altar, called turncoat, renegade, and apostate, and an enemy to his church and his holy religion. His neighbours avoid him with fear ; his life and property become insecure ; every effort is made to injure him in all his pursuits ; he walks about a marked man, and the withering curse of the priest is on his head. Those who witness scenes of incendrianism, of plunder, and of blood, dare not give evidence ; the juryman dreads the consequences of his verdict ; those who suffer are afraid to prosecute through dread of being subjected to a still greater calamity ; the witness prevaricates in his evidence, he is terrified

into perjury, and the priest absolves him ! Perjury, in the present state of Ireland, amongst the lower classes, is in such instances, rarely, if ever, considered a crime ; it is in the cause of the church, and the end justifies the means. The influence of superstition and of political excitement effectually paralyzes the power of the law, and force and fear are the authorities in Ireland.

Wonderful discoveries have of late years been made in the science of government. The sagacity of our present rulers has found out that a priest-ridden peasantry are the wisest and purest class of electors ; that the country should be surrendered up to the dominion of Popish priests and radicals ; that Romanism has ceased to be a dark, gross, and idolatrous superstition ; that its priests are the meek, holy, legitimate, and inspired successors of the apostles, and that they hold the keys to shut or open at pleasure the gates of heaven or of hell, just as people confess to them and receive absolution at their hands. But, above all, the fatal discovery has been made, that religious instruction is not a concern of the State ; that to educate the youthful mind in gospel principles is a matter of indifference ; that having achieved the glorious victory of the Reformation, we should throw away its fruits and again surrender the country to the dark guidance of the priests of that idolatrous church, from which, after a long and arduous struggle, we are happily emancipated ; that we should establish schools to propagate and perpetuate the soul-destroying heresies of Rome ; that the youth of the country should be quietly surrendered to the enlightened care of these blind guides, and care taken that not one solitary ray of divine truth should penetrate their minds ; and that the priests should be allowed, in opposition alike to the precepts of Christ and his apostles, to close the sacred volume, and teach the people the horrible blasphemy that it is dangerous to read that book Divine Inspiration penned for their instruction.

The Rev. Robert J. McGhee, in his admirable speech at Exeter Hall, on June 20, 1835, after incontrovertibly proving from *Den's Theology*, the *Roman Catholic Directory* for the years 1832, 33, 34, and 35, and other authentic works of the Church of Rome, that the Roman Catholic Church accounts Protestants of all denominations, whoever they may be, heretics ; that she holds, that by baptism (for she allows heretical baptism to be valid) we are brought under the power of her domination ; that so far from granting us toleration, she holds it to be a duty to exterminate the rites of our worship, and to *compel* heretics by *corporal punishments*, to return to the faith of Popery ; and that the punishments so denounced against us are

confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death; adds, in his usual clear and forcible language—

“Let no man now pretend to be ignorant of the sources of those fitful flames of desolation and of death which are ever bursting up from the volcanic bosom of unhappy Ireland. You talk of bringing over your legislation to allay them—you might as well legislate to arrest the eruptions of Vesuvius, or to extinguish the lava which boils in the burning bosom of Etna. There is a monster, like him who was fabled to be buried beneath the Sicilian mountain, who spreads his giant length and breadth beneath all the deep foundations of that unhappy land, and manifests the heaving efforts of his existence only by his ceaseless strivings to convulse, to agitate, and to inflame. What peace can we expect in such a state of things as this, when confiscation, exile, imprisonment and death—the very horrors of war, are incorporated in the very framework of man’s social existence? When men, who ought to be the ministers of Christ instead of taking the leaves from the tree of life to sweeten the bitter waters of contention, evoke, as it were, the demons of discord to poison the streams which should flow pure and unsullied from the ‘fountain of living waters:’ where religion, that blessing which God has given us to heal the wounds of human sorrow, to still the storms of human passion, and to renew and to regenerate the apostate heart of man, is made, in the hands of its ministers, an instrument to rankle every wound, to exasperate every passion, to ulcerate, to fester, to gangrene into death the natural corruption of the guilty human heart.

• • Who can be surprised at the excesses of the deluded peasantry of Ireland, when the very crimes of the unhappy people are enumerated amongst ‘the virtues’ of the authoritative standard of their spiritual guides; when the deeds of guilt and darkness, which are reduced to horrid practice over the drunken debauch of the midnight assassin, are debated in principle in the sober mornings of religious conference among the priests? • • We cannot wonder, if those dark and guilty purposes which are cherished in the ear of the confessional, are sometimes let out in the imprudent effusion of the intemperate public orator?”

But we have seen enough of the dismal fruits of Popery, whose leprous touch has blasted the prospects, and paralysed the energies, and fatally infected with its contagion, that noble island, whose natural fertility and extent of pasturage would render her indeed, under the sanctifying, civilising influences of pure Protestant, principles,

“Great, glorious, and free,—

First flower of the earth and first gem of the sea.”

But so long as the intolerable incubus of Popery is permitted to feed upon her stamina, and revel undisturbed upon the costly banquet of human souls and human freedom, she cannot but remain a monumental wreck, a trophy of the grinding tyranny of Papal power, and a solemn warning to all other nations of the

inevitable disasters universally attendant upon Popish ascendancy.

The functionaries of the Vatican doubtless rejoice with no small feelings of triumph at the prostrate position of Ireland, and the evident tendency of events to consummate her moral ruin. But we may be permitted to weep over the infatuation which, regardless of the living testimony of history, the awful warnings of unnumbered martyrs, who had passed gloriously to their rest through the flames kindled by the bigotry, and superstition of '*infallible*' Rome, and turning a deaf ear to the kind and faithful admonitions, and patriotic advice of thousands and thousands more, who knew what Popery was, and foresaw but too clearly the unavoidable consequences of throwing scorn and contempt upon the pious measures of our ancestors, and destroying barriers raised for the endangered security of the throne and the altar of the land; opened madly the flood-gates of Popery upon the country, and placed in the hands of sworn enemies weapons with which to pierce and shatter the boasted and perfect constitution of Great Britain. But we are told by some that Ireland is *tranquil*,* that she never before enjoyed such security and tranquillity as she did could a Lord Lieutenant of such exalted liberality of sentiment as Lord Normanby, who could issue orders for the removal from the muster-roll of magistrates a *gentleman* against whom in

* "We have heard much of late about 'the tranquillity' of Ireland, and the pacifying effects of Lord Normanby's 'liberal measures.' Let the following extract from parliamentary returns speak to the boldness and falsehood of these pretences:—

In 1836 the committals for crime were	23,891
In 1837 these committals had increased to	27,398

Being, in one year, an increase of 3,507 !

But if the committals had *increased*, the convictions had *decreased*, shewing increased difficulty in executing the law, and the augmented want of dependence on juries, &c.

In 1836 the convictions were	18,110	out of 23,891 committals.
In 1837 they were only	10,529	out of 27,398 committals.

Shewing a decrease amounting to 7,581

Again: the proclamations issued by the Lord Lieutenant for the apprehension of criminals in 1836-7 numbered 520

But of the reward offered in these, there were only claimed 19

Leaving unclaimed altogether no less than 501 !!

So that even money, in that poor country, cannot procure evidence. Thus does combination elude justice.

This is not, however, the only mode of viewing the state of Ireland.

the discharge of his duty, the breath of slander never uttered an accusation of partiality, and with the same breath give directions for an invitation to the vice-royal dinner to be sent to the seditious agitator of Ireland !

The tranquillity of Ireland consists entirely in the absence of open rebellion in arms. In every other respect she is distracted and convulsed from the centre to the circumference, while a withering and blighting blackness pervades her length and breadth ; a darkness gross and palpable, not of that description which broods over lovely landscapes and soft and peaceful glades, but gloomy, lurid, sepulchral, athwart which if a beam of sunshine pass, it is but to reveal objects loathsome and revolting—a darkness revelling in the garniture of the tomb, the decay of humanity, and the putrescent processes of corruption. As soon might you compare the rude blast which heralds blackening skies and bursting storms with the noiseless breath of the Sirocco—as well compare the bleak gust of winter, which howls across the foaming deep, scattering desolation and dismay, and strewing every shore with the shattered fragments of stranded navies, to the soft and balmy zephyr of summer, which bears upon its wings nothing but fragrancys and delight ! Tranquillity, indeed ! when murder stalks with impunity in broad daylight—when the domestic hearth of the innocent drinks the blood of its owner, and the ruthless noonday assassin dyes his hand alike in the life-blood of the peer and the peasant. How long shall the soil of Ireland, saturated with the gore of her bravest and most peaceful children, cry to heaven for vengeance upon the guilty perpetrators and abettors of such horrifying crimes ? Popery is emphatically, as we think no attentive observer will deny, the perpetrator, the criminal, at whose door these untold enormities must be brought. But what shall we say of the criminality of those, who with the

It is necessary, not only to regard the *number*, but the *nature*, of the crimes committed :

In 1836, out of the 23,891 crimes, 620 were murder.

In 1837, out of the 27,398 crimes, 722 were murder.

Being an increase in one year of 102 murders—that is, an increase of 17 per cent. But it must be remarked, that in the ten most Protestant counties—that is, in those counties where the number of Protestants and Papists are sometimes almost equal, the homicides committed in 1837 did not equal in number those committed in the Popish county of Tipperary alone ! In Fermanagh, a county in which the inhabitants are almost exclusively Protestants, only one murder out of the 722 was committed. The same may be said of Londonderry. We trust that these few facts will speak out plainly to the people of England as to the ‘tranquillity’ of Ireland, and as to the unchangeable nature of persecuting Popery.”—*Protestant Magazine*.

power to check these atrocities, and consequently the responsibility attaching to the possession of such a power, culpably neglect their duty, and instead of exercising the legitimate influence they wield to stem the torrent of iniquity, virtually abandon the wretched victims of Popish bigotry and cruelty to their fate? What shall we say of those who, possessed of power to punish, fondle and caress the fomenters of discord and the chief instigators of turbulence and animosity, who coolly bluster out a senseless lying boast of the tranquillity of the country, and strive to hide, by every artifice and manœuvre common to base and little minds, the real and fearfully alarming state of disaffection and avidity for rebellion, into which their impolitic and criminal mal-administration of privilege, patronage, and influence, has fomented the fettered slaves of a ferocious priesthood?

But what are the remedies for these multiform but ungenerated evils most likely to prove successful in ameliorating the condition and giving a healthy tone to the moral and social character of the population?

We do not shut our eyes to the fact that the abject misery, vice, and destitution, and the increasing redundancy, of the Irish poor, could not fail to find a preventive check in a well-digested, well-arranged, and well-administered legal provision for the poor; and, to a certain extent, we are inclined to recommend the pamphlet of Mr. Revans.* But this, though important, and a step which every honest man who loves his country and feels the humiliating shame and sorrow which the present deplorable condition of Ireland must engender in the loyal and patriotic breast, would not *radically* effect the evil. The root of Irish misery lies beyond the reach of legislation; legislation may do much to soften the condition and improve the moral position of the Irish, but she can apply no healing balm to the gangrened wound which feeds upon her vitals; it is Christianity, and Christianity alone, that holds possession of the potent efficacy to medicate the bitter waters of her misery, hush the heaving tempest of her internal feuds, and allay the raging fever of her malady.

The Established Church is a powerful instrument for the civilization of Ireland and the improvement of the moral character of the people. The pamphlet of Mr. Colquhoun on this subject is worthy the most attentive perusal. The labours of a Christian ministry, in short, are the only means that

* Without hazarding, at present, any opinion upon the intrinsic merits or demerits of the Irish Poor Law, which has become a law Mr. Revan's work was written; we believe that *its working* has disappointed the expectations of its best friends.

appear, to our minds, at all likely to prove permanently remedial. Let the Irish Church be strengthened instead of weakened; let her capabilities be extended to the utmost limits of the noble field of Christian exertion which lies before her; let her clergy be multiplied and their hands strengthened, and we should not fear the result. But so long as the *minds* of the people are kept in Egyptian darkness, and the light of the glorious Gospel of our Lord and only Saviour is systematically excluded from their hearts by the self-deifying tyranny of Popish priests, and the number of the Protestant clergy is confessedly inadequate even for the Protestant population, how can we expect that civilization and order can be restored, or the inhabitants cease to be lawless and depraved? The Word of God must be planted in every corner of the land, care taken to provide the blessings of a Scriptural education to the children, and mental cultivation and moral enlightenment to the adult population. Mr. Mahony, a most intelligent solicitor, in his evidence before the House of Commons, in 1832, with regard to the civilization of Ireland, says—"I have recommended the rigid enforcement of the law, so as to compel all ranks of clergy to reside at their sees, or at their parishes; for, in a country such as Ireland, where absenteeism is an acknowledged evil, in the moral and political sense of the word, I consider the *moral influence* of such a class of well-educated gentlemen, such as the clergy are, to be above all price; for, though the Protestant clergy may not extend their religion, they must extend civilization where they reside." Mr. Blake, a Roman Catholic, says—"That the Irish Church has great power of promoting the interests of education among the people." Mr. Barrington says—"There are many parts of the county of Cork in which there is no resident landlord; none but the Protestant clergyman." Major Bunn says—"The Protestant clergy are resident clergy: it would be a great loss if they were driven to leave the country." The Archbishop of Dublin says—"I have observed a sort of nucleus of civilization formed by the house of a clergyman, who is, perhaps, the only gentleman within a considerable distance, and frequently the only one at least who takes care to afford instruction, promote cleanliness, encourage the progress of the arts of life, improve the domestic habits of the parishioners, and relieve their bodily wants. I have heard innumerable instances of the charitable exertions of the Protestant clergy, even of those who are commonly regarded as the most bigoted against the Romish religion; I have found them active in relieving the temporal wants of Roman Catholics, and liberal to them in many cases even beyond their means." Major Bunn says—"The clergy

were very charitable, giving, without distinction of sect, food and medicine, and every other assistance." Mr. Foster says—"The clergy settle the disputes of the Roman Catholics, lend them money, distribute medicine, and superintend various charities." And Major Woodward, Inspector of Prisons, says—"I must, as a public officer whose duties call him into close contact with the people through the most remote and deserted parts of the kingdom, declare, in common justice, that *were it not for the residence and moral and political influence of the parochial clergy, all trace of refinement and civilization would disappear.*"

We should wish to see some great effort made for extending the agency of the Irish Church; an effort emanating from and headed by our Bishops. This, we feel persuaded, and we have not given the subject a transient or hasty consideration, is the only practicable remedy for the evils of the sister island. This would effectually infuse light and civilization, pure and undefiled religion, and its myriad of attendant blessings, throughout the entire mass of the population; and if this effort be but supplemented by an extensive system of protection (protection especially for converts from Popery, on whom the hottest vials of barbarous persecution are sure to be poured)—a system perfect in its organization, and while it is rendered thoroughly practical and efficient,* it is likewise made subservient to ecclesiastical institutions, and under the direction, patronage, and jurisprudence of influential members of the Established Church, we see no reason to doubt the complete renovation of Ireland, and the elevation of the character of her people to an unprecedented height of moral greatness. Domestic tranquility, the comforts and blessings of social life, the pure and hallowed feelings of confidence and peaceful satisfaction in existing institutions, the free and legitimate exercise of conscience, prosperity, happiness, and peace would crowd the country, and an atmosphere of piety be *flung around* every cottage in the land.

We shall conclude with quoting the memorable words of Lord Lansdowne, when proposing to place in every parish of Ireland a resident minister:—

"If any improvement is to be effected in the condition of Ireland, it must be effected through the instrumentality of the Church, through the residence of a parochial clergy. I consider the permanent residence of a Protestant clergyman on his living to be most beneficial in its results. I can assure the House that the utility of having a Protestant

* The "Irish Protestant Tenantry Society" appears to have been established for the purpose of affording protection to Irish Protestants and converts from Popery. We wish it every success and support.

minister permanently resident among his flock, even though he may not be the minister of religion to the majority of his parish, will be beyond all calculation. The Protestant clergyman will be to his parish a minister of peace; for he will, by his station and his constant residence, have constant opportunities of conciliating their good will, by sympathising in their cares and distresses, and by doing them a variety of good offices. If we strip the Protestant parochial clergy of all those causes of irritation which exist as to the exaction of tithes; if we relieve the Establishment from the odium attached to it in consequence of the collection of vestry cess; if we place in every parish in Ireland men of independence as parochial priests, we shall establish a firm link of connection between the Protestant clergy and the Catholic population, which will be found most advantageous to the Established Church, and which will lead to the welfare and happiness of the people of Ireland."

ART. III.—*The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England, from the Reformation under Henry VIII.* By THOMAS PRICE, D.D. In two vols. 8vo. Vol. II. London: William Ball. pp. 647. 1838.

WHEN we closed our remarks on Mr. Price's former volume, we were not aware that we should so soon be called upon to meet him again. Since the first volume was completed, it appears that our author has acquired the distinguished honour of a Dissenting D.D.; for on the title-page of that volume stand in all their simplicity the words THOMAS PRICE; while on that of the *second* the above distinction is appended to the name. We know not how Dissenting degrees are conferred, nor are we acquainted with their value; but we do know, that the late Robert Hall, though the degree of D.D. had been conferred upon him by a Scottish University, declined the use of it even to the day of his death. Dr. Price, as we must now term him, may have merited this honourable distinction by the former volume of his *History*, or by his laudable exertions as the Editor of that organ of Dissent, the *Eclectic Review*. By the way, we may observe that, on several very important subjects, the sentiments broached in the *Eclectic* and those contained in this history exactly coincide.

In the *Preface* to the former volume our author states his determination to conclude his labours in two volumes. The second, however, terminates with the Restoration, and without entering on any of the numerous important ecclesiastical affairs involved in that event. We are informed in the *second Preface*, that the work may be considered as complete, though the

author, without, however, giving any pledge, will feel himself at liberty to usher into the world another volume on the *Modern History of Nonconformity*. We have ancient and modern universal histories; but we never heard, till now, of the ancient and modern history of Nonconformity.

The *Preface* to the present volume confirms us in an opinion which we have long entertained, namely, that it is not possible for a Dissenting historian to be free from party bias, or to write with impartiality. As writers of history, the Dissenters have retrograded, however they may have advanced in the science of *politics*. Neal and Palmer, and Bogue and Bennet, the historians of Dissent, were quite free from the charge of candour and honesty; but Dr. Price excels all his predecessors. The deteriorating influence of politics is evident in the writings of the Dissenters of the present day, when contrasted with those of their predecessors; for, bad as are those of the latter, those of the former, if possible, are infinitely worse. The perusal of this volume has reminded us of the remark of Coleridge:—"I have known very few Dissenters indeed, whose hatred to the Church of England was not a much more active principle of action with them than their love of Christianity."*

In the close of our former Article we intimated that we should accompany the author over the wide field which he had marked out, and we now hasten to perform the promise which we then made. But before we enter upon the body of the work, we must detain our readers for a brief space while we consider certain extraordinary statements which arrested our attention in the *Preface* :—

"The present work owes its origin to a course of lectures which the author delivered to the congregation meeting in Devonshire-square, London."

The substance of the two volumes, therefore, was delivered in lectures to the author's congregation. Now we cannot refrain from asking, are these the subjects for a minister to bring before his people? Is this the way to preach "*Jesus Christ and him crucified?*" Is this the author's method of conveying Christian instruction? Is it not preaching Dissent rather than the Gospel? We ask, do any of the clergy of the Church of England degrade the pulpit to the level of a common lecture-room, and amuse their hearers with discourses on Nonconformity and the points at issue between Churchmen and Dissenters, instead of labouring to advance them in the way to heaven? Our author could

* Coleridge's *Table Talk*, vol. ii. 20.

not, in the delivery of these lectures, have consulted the edification of his flock, for the volumes abound in railing accusations against his brethren of the Church of England; on the contrary, he must have been under the influence of those political principles which, in the case of the vast majority of Dissenters, are eating out the very vitals of Christianity from their hearts.

As a reason for writing the history of Nonconformity, we are told that it "is so blended with the progress of civil freedom, as to render an intimate knowledge of the latter essential to an accurate estimate and due appreciation of the former." *Preface*, p. 6. It is constantly asserted by Dissenters, that we owe our civil and religious privileges to the views and exertions, first of the Puritans, and subsequently of the Nonconformists. It is, however, an undisputed fact that the Puritans, who took up arms against Charles I., fought, not for the principles of religious liberty, but that they might impose their own system of church-government on the whole country. The views of the members of the Church of England were, at all events, as enlightened as those of their opponents. The former were the first advocates of religious toleration, and the first to apply the principle, which was done at the Revolution in 1688. The Revolution, indeed, furnishes the most irrefragible argument against the position, that Nonconformity nurtured the principles of liberty; for it is certain that the Revolution was effected by Churchmen; and it is equally certain that the Dissenters of that day, almost to a man, sided with the infatuated James II., who had wheedled them into submission by his treacherous *Declaration of Indulgence*. Popery and arbitrary power were then impending over the country, and by whom was the danger averted? By Churchmen! The Dissenters were worse than passive, for they sanctioned, some by actual addresses, and all by their refusal to oppose the measures of the Court, the designs of the monarch, whose sole aim was to re-establish Popery and trample upon the liberties of his people. Did the Dissenters oppose Popery? No! they remained silent! It is a fact which ought ever to be mentioned to the praise of the English Church—a fact, too, of which Churchmen may well be proud, of which, especially in these days of spurious liberalism, they may be permitted to boast—that during the short reign of the second James, embracing a period of little more than four years, nearly three hundred separate works against Popery, and in defence of civil and religious liberty, were written and published by clergymen, while only three solitary treatises proceeded, during the same period, from the pens of Nonconformists. Let Dr. Price ponder this circumstance, and he will scarcely venture to hazard an observa-

tion, so obviously destitute of all foundation in truth, as that to which we have now directed the attention of our readers.*

One of the most remarkable features of this volume, like the preceding, is the author's bitter hostility to an established church. His indignation boils over in almost every chapter. One of the choicest morsels on this favourite topic is contained in the *Preface*, where it stands, we suppose, as an intimation of the kind of entertainment which the reader who accompanies the author through the volume may reasonably expect. We extract the following:—

“The further he has looked into history, the deeper has become his conviction that the alliance at present subsisting between the Church and the State is part of the grand apostasy—an unnatural and most pernicious association, which must be terminated before the ultimate triumphs of the Christian faith are achieved. The essential spirit of Popery has been retained under a Protestant name, and the consequence has been, distraction to the State, and formality and worldly-mindedness to the Church. The author does not wish to be regarded as neutral on this cardinal point; his opinions have been maturely formed; they are the growth of years, have gathered strength with the increase of his knowledge, and are destined, in his judgment—slowly it may be, but still effectually—to remodel the institutions of society.” *Preface*, p. iii.†

* Several catalogues of the works against Popery were published about the time of the Revolution. Three are now lying before us—one from the pen of Dr. Claggett another by Wake, subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury, and a third by Peck. They bear the dates 1687, 1688, and 1689, and contain a list and description of all the works published against Popery during the reign of James II. and the last few years of that of Charles II. The number of works, and most of them of considerable size too, published by members of the Church of England, was, as has been stated already, nearly *three hundred*! There treatises only were written by Dissenters during the same period. One of the writers, in closing his list, says, “I need not here to beg our Nonconformist brethren's pardon for this slender account of their writings against *Popery* during the reign of *King James the Second*, because I have used great diligence to attain an exact account of them. However, if there be any discourses written by them, but omitted in this *catalogue*, or if any of those in the *catalogue* whose authors' names I could not recover do belong to them; if either the authors, or any friends for them, will be pleased to send the titles of the books, with the author's name, to *Mr. R. Baldwin*, the publisher of this *catalogue*, they shall be inserted in the next edition of this *catalogue*, if it have one.”

† The Puritans are censured by this author for their attachment to a religious establishment. He tells us that had they taken another step,

This precious morsel is from the pen of a man who does not hesitate to join with Papists and Infidels. We are not disposed to argue the question of establishments at this time, or we could easily show that experience has fully proved the falsehood of our author's assertions on this subject. But we cannot refrain from a few observations on Dr. Price's charge of worldliness! We would ask, who are the more worldly at the present moment—the great body of the clergy, or the mass of Dissenting ministers? Are not the latter, almost to a man, under the influence of the leaven of politics? Let the character of the preaching of the two parties be considered, and we are convinced that, with very few exceptions, it will be found that the clergy never introduce the question of politics into the pulpit, while the practice is almost universal among the Dissenters. Is not the introduction of politics into the pulpit a proof of worldliness, and, indeed, the strongest proof that could possibly be furnished? The influence of the State, of which this author speaks so much, is far less injurious in the case of the Church of England than the influence of the people in the case of Dissenters. That influence keeps the minister in a state of absolute dependence on the people. Unless, therefore, he consents to preach such doctrines as are palatable to his congregation he must depart. Of this fact he is fully conscious, and thus a temptation to preach smooth things is thrown in his way, which it requires no ordinary degree of fortitude to overcome, and which, we verily believe, is rarely overcome by Dissenting ministers. The clergy of the Church of England are exposed to no such temptation, nor is there any influence to prevent them from declaring the whole counsel of God. It is our firm

“by enfranchising Christianity from the degrading trammels of a State alliance, they would have increased a hundred-fold their claims on the admiration and gratitude of mankind. Subsequent evils would thus have been avoided, religion would have been preserved from a thousand reproaches, and the achievement now reserved for some future day would have crowned with yet brighter glory this illustrious period of our history.”—p. 170. Is not the conduct of Dr. Price and his party calculated to bring reproach on the religion of the Saviour? Is it not most inconsistent for men who make such professions to associate with Papists, Socinians, and Infidels, for political and other purposes? If such conduct is not calculated to bring religion into contempt, we know not what is. Our author's name stands enrolled in the list of persons who form the committee of a society recently established for the promotion of *religious equality*. Is this consistent in a man who professes to devote himself to the great work of bringing souls to the Saviour?

belief, that the Dissenting ministers of the present day are much more secular in their views and feelings than the clergy of the Church of England. In proof of our belief we are content to appeal to the conduct of the two parties. Even honest Dissenters have admitted the evil influence of their own principles. "Among us Dissenters (says one) there is often a good deal of quizzing and laughing about Queen Elizabeth being the head of the Church, and we think that our banter on this topic is totally unanswerable by the united wisdom of the whole bench of Bishops; but here, in the instance of this little suburban dissenting chapel, is a specimen of a female head of the Church, exercising a most despotic and unbounded sway; her will is law in every thing, *because she subscribes ten guineas a year.*"* Is there, we ask, a single Dissenting congregation in the country which is not more or less under similar influence?—and is not this influence far more injurious to the interests of piety than that which the State is supposed to exercise over the clergy of the English Church? In our opinion there can be no room for doubt on the subject.

While on this topic there are a few passages in the body of the work which may as well be noticed before we proceed. Alluding to the disputes between the Lords and Commons in the year 1641, Dr. Price is pleased to say:—

"In times of general tranquillity the Upper House may be able to preserve its relative positions, and to confer some benefits on the nation; but in those seasons of change which occasionally transpire, when the foundations of society are examined and the visions of the future supplant the remembrance of the past, it must invariably yield to the omnipotence of the popular branch of the legislature." p. 196.

Our author's political views are pretty distinctly stated in the preceding extract: and it will be seen that they, like those of almost all the Dissenters of the present day, are in strict accordance with the avowed sentiments of that heterogeneous mass of Papists, and Infidels, and Destructives, who are now marshalled against the English Church. The extract furnishes the strongest evidence of the truth of our assertion, that the religion of modern Dissenters is made subservient to politics.

Forgetting, however, that, in various parts of the volume, he has played the politician, while he has sunk the minister of religion, the author talks of the "subserviency" of the clergy:

"On the return of the Stuarts (says he) the Bishops were re-instated in their former dignities, but the external splendour which the hierarchy

* Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister. p. 61.

thus obtained, has been more than counterbalanced by the political subserviency and moral degradation of the clergy." p. 224.

Had we space, we should contrast the subserviency of the clergy with that of the body of Dissenting ministers at present existing. So subservient are they, that to obtain a political object, they will support Papists, Infidels, and men of loose morals. Is there anything in the conduct of the clergy analagous to the common practices of Dissenters, as exemplified at the election of members for the Imperial Parliament? But we must abstain from further remark on this topic, though in itself of great importance.

We now proceed to the volume itself, which commences with the accession of Charles I., a monarch who finds no favour in the eyes of our sagacious author. It cannot be expected that we should analyze the work, nor that we can enter upon all the subjects introduced within the compass of this volume. We shall therefore proceed to remark upon some of those misrepresentations which abound in the work, and which are to be attributed to the author's prejudices. It seems almost impossible for a Dissenter to write history, at all events the history of the Nonconformists and the Church of England, we will not say with perfect impartiality, but even with common honesty. Dishonest as Neal is, he is quite an honest man when compared with those who have chronicled the affairs of Dissenters since his days.

We observe that Dr. Price very frequently, in speaking of the *Papists*, terms them *Catholics*. Is this term adopted through ignorance, or from what he would term courtesy to the Popish party, with whom he and his brethren are in such close alliance? Its utter inapplicablity to the Church of Rome ought to have prevented him from using it as he frequently does in various parts of his history.

Almost at the commencement of this volume the author commences his attack on Archbishop Laud, which is continued at intervals until his death upon the scaffold. The spirit, indeed, in which many modern writers have indulged in speaking of Laud is exactly the same with that by which his murderers were actuated, and which did not cease to exist even when he was laid in the silent tomb; for we find that his memory is still assailed with a bitterness worthy of a Prynne, a Burton, or a Bastwick. We are not the advocates of Laud. We could not concur in many of his views, and some of his practices we should condemn; but we feel it our duty to rescue his character from unmerited reproach, and to defend him against those utterly groundless charges with which certain writers are still inclined to load his memory. Of those who in recent times have written of him

with unbecoming rancour, and in a most unchristian spirit, our author must occupy the first place, as the following extracts will fully prove:—

“The vain, self-willed, and arbitrary Buckingham was succeeded in the King’s confidence by the low-minded and superstitious Laud, whose fierce intolerance and savage despotism did more to alienate the people’s affections from the King’s government than any other circumstance of his reign.” p. 33.

The old charge of Popery is repeated by Dr. Price :—

“Such was the opinion of Laud’s Protestantism at Rome, that a cardinal’s hat was tendered him on the very day he received intelligence of Abbot’s decease. Though he did not accept it, his refusal must have been faltering and half-hearted, as the offer was renewed a few days afterwards, and is noticed in his diary in terms which sufficiently bespeak the vacillating state of his mind.” p. 49.

Again :—

“Laud’s ambition and selfishness continued him a Protestant, when his general spirit and the complexion of his theology strongly inclined him to the Catholic Church. In everything but the accidents of his position, Laud was a Catholic. His temper and superstition, and his hard-heartedness and cruelty, all bespoke him the disciple of that system which reigned at Rome. He was out of his place in a Protestant Church. Under his administration the Church of England wore the apparel and spoke much of the language of Rome.” p. 50-51.

“Throughout his career, Laud had evinced an unrelenting and merciless disposition ; but his recent elevation to the see of London afforded him a fuller opportunity for its development. He had evidently proposed to himself the worst models which the history of his intolerant Church supplied.” p. 57.

But still further :—

“The bitterness of his zeal now shewed itself in deeds of blood, which have associated him in the estimation of posterity with the Bonners and Gardiners of a former age.” p. 69.

“Laud’s attachment to the symbols of Popery was unvarying, and shewed itself upon all occasions.” p. 73.

“Even Fox’s Martyrs and Bishop Jewel’s works were prohibited. Such was the much-lauded protestantism of Laud.” p. 117.

“Laud’s diary is one of the most singular records extant of human weakness and folly.” p. 302.

We have thrown together into one view the various passages in which Dr. Price indulges his spleen against the memory of a man who, with all his failings, was conscientious and honest, and even as tolerant, as Dr. Price most inconsistently admits, as the Puritans of the Commonwealth. It may fairly be asked whether there is any foundation in truth on which to rest the heavy accusations

enumerated in the preceding extracts. We, without attempting to defend all his practices, unhesitatingly reply there is no foundation whatever: and in this instance, as in many others, the author, instead of being an impartial historian, is a mean slanderer of an individual whose views were as enlightened as those of his countrymen at the same period. In this very volume the author confutes his own statements; for, alluding to one charge, and that the most grievous, the charge of Popery, he most inconsistently admits that it was but partially true. His own words are: "Yet an impartial investigation of the case proves that the charge was but partially true." p. 48. Still, after this admission—an admission most reluctantly wrung from an unwilling witness—the author proceeds to repeat the charge, which he himself had asserted to be unproved! After such a specimen of dishonesty and gross inconsistency, the impartial reader will scarcely expect to meet with any fair and honest account of men or things, where Dr. Price's peculiar views are concerned.

This charge of Popery admits of a ready refutation. The *canons* of 1640, those *canons* which were alleged against him at his trial, disprove it. The third *canon* is thus entitled: "*For suppressing the growth of Popery.*" In this *canon* certain means are enjoined with a view to suppress Popery throughout the country. Similar means are never resorted to by Dissenters, and yet Laud is condemned as a Papist! It is well known that the illustrious Chillingworth was brought back from Popery to Protestantism through the instrumentality of the Archbishop. Laud might have escaped to the continent and thus have evaded his enemies; what, however, was his determination? He resolved not to fly, but to remain and abide by the consequences. His words are remarkable, and ought to make an impression even on Dr. Price. After stating, in a letter, that he would not quit England, he adds: "And whither should I fly? Should I go into France or any other Popish country, it would be to give some seeming ground to that charge of Popery they have endeavoured with so much industry and so little reason to fasten upon me. No, I am resolved not to think of flight: but, continuing where I am, patiently to expect and bear what a good and a wise Providence hath provided for me, of what kind soever it shall be."* Is this the language of a man inclined to Popery? Yet the charge is repeated century after century by partial and party historians. We are informed by Evelyn, who was at Rome when the intelligence of his execution was brought to that city, that the English *Fathers* read the speech which he had delivered on the

* Twell's Life of Pocock. p. 85.

scaffold, "and commented upon it with no small satisfaction and content; and looked upon him as one that was a great enemy to them, and stood in their way: while one of the blackest crimes imputed to him was his being popishly affected." In replying to that part of the charge which attributed to him an intention of introducing Popery, he thus remarks at his trial: "If I had a purpose to blast the true religion established in the Church of England, and to introduce Popery, sure I took a wrong way to it. For, my Lords, I have staid more from going to Rome, and reduced more that were already gone, than I believe any bishop or divine in this kingdom hath done: and some of them men of great abilities, and some persons of great place. And is this the way to introduce Popery? My Lords, if I have blemished the true Protestant religion, how could I have brought these men to it? And if I had promised to introduce Popery, I would never have reduced these men from it." Still the charge of Popery is repeated. With far greater propriety might the same charge be advanced against Dr. Price and his brethren, who hesitate not, on many occasions, to do what Laud never did, namely, unite with Papists against their Protestant brethren.

The truth is that the charge of Popery was alleged by the Puritans against all those who were zealous in complying with the ceremonies of the Church. It is readily admitted that some questionable rites were revived, that others were made of more importance than they deserved, and that Laud was over-zealous in imposing them upon the clergy. But it must be remembered that the Puritans, on the other hand, were disposed to reject all those ceremonies which were enjoined by the Rubric, and to the observance of which they had solemnly pledged themselves. If Laud went to one extreme, the Puritans went to the opposite; and as the latter were aiming at the establishment of Presbytery and the ruin of the English Church, it was perfectly natural that Laud, and those who acted with him, should feel it to be their duty to stand up in defence of the system, which not only rested, as they contended, on the practice of the apostolic age, but was established by the law of the land. These considerations must be permitted to have their due weight with all those who wish to form an impartial estimate of the history of those eventful days. But admitting Laud's zeal for the ceremonies, can the charge of Popery be fairly alleged against him? Some excuse may be offered for the Puritans in their hostility, since party spirit was high at the period, and opprobrious epithets were common on both sides; but for Dr. Price's conduct, sitting in the repose of his study, to bring a charge, which he knows and even admits to be false, no palliation can be offered. Such

conduct merits the severest reprobation, and the man who is guilty of it must be deemed unworthy of credit as a historian.

Wilson, who always leans towards the Puritans, clears Laud from the imputation of Popery: "He never could bring his neck under the Roman yoke, though he might stick for the grandeur of the clergy."* MAY, the parliamentary historian, admits: "The archbishop was much against the court of Rome, though not against that church in so high a kind."† His work against Fisher, the jesuit, was printed several times. This production alone ought to satisfy reasonable minds that the charge was unfounded. Even Andrew Marvel asserts: "If for nothing else, yet for his learned work against Fisher, he deserved far another fate than he met with, and ought not now to be mentioned without due honour."‡ And in opposition to Dr. Price, who cannot even lament his cruel death, Mr. Hallam remarks of his murderers: "The most unjustifiable act of these zealots was the death of Laud."§ Burnet's testimony must, we imagine, though he was a bishop, be deemed, at all events, impartial even by Dr. Price: "He was learned, sincere, and zealous, regular in his own life, and humble in his private deportment, but hot and indiscreet, eagerly pursuing some things inconsiderable or mischievous."||

As to the charge of cruelty, we need only refer our readers to the history of the period, to show that he was neither more cruel nor less tolerant than his opponents; and this truth is admitted by Dr. Price himself in the volume before us. We presume that the censure of Laud's Diary is grounded on those passages in which he records his feelings relative to dreams and certain impressions, or what were usually termed omens. In that age, however, all men were under the influence of the same feelings. The belief in witchcraft, for instance, was general; and whatever may have been the views of Laud, they were not peculiar to him, but common to the times. Let Dr. Price read some of the works of "Richard Baxter," and especially "Cotton Mather's History of New England!" He will find passages in both these authors, with which that portion of the Diary to which he alludes will bear no comparison. The fact is, that the belief in dreams, omens, witchcraft, and Satanic influence, at that time, was almost general. Why, then, should Laud be charged with

* Wilson's Annals of James I.

† May. p. 16.

‡ Rehearsal Transposed. p. 281.

§ Hallam's Con. His., vol 2, p. 236.

|| Burnet.

superstition, in a matter in which he acted in conformity with the universally received opinions of the age.

Dr. Price himself must have known that the charge of suppressing the works of Fox and Jewel was unfounded. He must have known that it was not insisted on by the managers at his trial, who would not have relinquished it, unless it had been false. It was denied by the Archbishop: yet, for the purpose of blackening his memory, it is again brought forward by Dr. Price. Laud challenged his enemies to the proof: but no proof could be adduced. It is, indeed, difficult to ascertain how this charge originated: but of one thing we may be certain, namely, that it was utterly false, or his great enemy, William Prynne, would not have permitted it to be withdrawn at the trial.

We beg the attention of our readers to the following passage, reminding them that it proceeds from the pen of one who has assumed the sacred office of a minister of the Gospel:—

“Darkness may cover the earth, and gross darkness the people, while the forms of an establishment are multiplied, and its worship rendered more gorgeous; but the light of truth must ultimately penetrate, when the false reputation of state priests will fade like a passing cloud, and their virtues be despised as the growth of *superstition*, and the agents of spiritual delusion and death.” p. 61.

The man who could dictate and commit to the press this passage, would, had he lived in the time of the Puritans, have disgraced himself by using those gross and uncharitable expressions which abound in the foul libels of that unhappy period. Nothing of the spirit of Christ, the spirit by which a Christian minister ought certainly to be actuated, can be traced in the preceding quotation. Similar passages are to be found in various portions of the work. To say nothing of the arrogance which the extract displays, its utter uncharitableness is sufficient to destroy the author's reputation as a historian. Who could depend on the statements of a man who can write in such a spirit? It will not, therefore, excite the surprise of our readers to find this gentleman setting forth his own inferences as historical truths. Speaking of the *Book of Sports*, in the time of Charles I., he remarks, “On the whole, it may safely be inferred, that some hundreds were excluded from the service of the Church, and subjected to various indignities and sufferings for their fidelity on this account.” p. 85.

The publication of the *Book of Sports* we should censure as strongly as Dr. Price. It was one of the worst acts of Charles's reign; and one is surprised at the rashness that could recommend and carry such an obnoxious measure into effect. Still

the truth must be regarded by the historian. We ask, then, whether a writer who is anxious to state only the truth would, in the absence of evidence on the subject, put forth inferences of his own, and palm them on the public as historical facts ! Is it the way to write history to say that such and such things may be inferred ? Now it is a fact, and this gentleman knows it, that very few were deprived of their livings on this account : many were undoubtedly censured by some of the bishops, but the suspensions even do not appear to have been numerous, and the deprivations must consequently have been still fewer. It is stated by Fuller that *three* only were silenced in Laud's own diocese, and that in them "there was a concurrence of other nonconformities." Dr. Price may censure the *Book of Sports* itself as strongly as he pleases, and no one would attempt to justify it : but he must not be permitted to publish his own fancies for undoubted verities. Let him state facts—and not infer that hundreds were deprived, when it is evident that the number *even of suspensions* was not large. He also forgets that some of the bishops were as anxious to oppose as others were to enforce the obnoxious book ; and, consequently, in some dioceses none of the clergy were even silenced, being supported in their refusal to comply by the countenance of their diocesans. Dr. Price gives it as his opinion that in consequence of Laud's proceedings there was a danger of the increase of Popery, p. 102. The danger was, however, far greater in the time of James II. : and yet at the latter period the Dissenters acted, as we have already remarked, a most questionable part, fraternizing with the Papists themselves for the purpose of opposing the Church of England. How will our author speak of the conduct of the Dissenters of that day, when he proceeds to write his modern history of Nonconformity. The conduct of the present race of Dissenters is so strikingly similar to that of their brethren in the reign of the SECOND JAMES, that we cannot refrain from pointing out some circumstances illustrative of the actions of the party at both periods.

We have already alluded to the treacherous Declaration of Indulgence issued by James II., under cover of which he intended to introduce Popery. Had there been no opposition, his efforts must have been crowned with success. That opposition proceeded from the clergy of the Established Church. Had the clergy acted the same part with the Dissenters, the Revolution would never have taken place. Let Dr. Price disprove our assertion if he is able. The measures of the court were approved by many of the Dissenters : some of them even counselled the court on the occasion. Their conduct extorted the

following remark from Mr. Hallam : "The Dissenters have been a little ashamed of their compliance with the Declaration, and of their silence in the Popish controversy." Our deliverance from Popery at that time was entirely owing to the Church of England, while the conduct of Dissenters tended to encourage the court in prosecuting their schemes. At the present time the same party unite hand and heart with Papists against the English Church, which was the bulwark against Popery in 1688, but which the Dissenters hate with a bitterness not to be described. It is impossible not to perceive that the Dissenters of the present day are acting on the very same principles with their predecessors in the reign of James II. But for the exertions of the clergy and laity of the Church of England, Popery must at that time have overspread the land ; and were the schemes of the Dissenters of the present day to succeed, Popery would effect a speedy triumph over Protestantism. We must still look to our Church as our defence against the encroachments of Rome and the efforts of her emissaries.

The writings of the divines of the Church of England became instrumental, in 1688, in opening the eyes of the people to the abominations of Popery, and in delivering the nation from arbitrary power. We have already seen that the Dissenters of that period were silent on the subject of Popery. We ask, do they now oppose Popery either from the pulpit or from the press ? Do they not, on the contrary, act in concert with O'Connell ? Their aim is the destruction of the Church of England ; and to accomplish that object, they are perfectly indifferent as to the means to be employed. The object of the Papists is the same : hence the union of Popery and Dissent at the present moment. What a yell of discord would be raised from one end of the country to another if the members of the Church of England were to unite with Papists for the accomplishment of any object, however laudable ! yet union has been cemented between Popery and Dissent. The Church of England never did, she never will, unite with Papists to effect any object : but, alas ! the same cannot be affirmed of Protestant Dissenters. Can these men be the friends of liberty ? Impossible ! In the year 1688 the Dissenters would have sacrificed every thing to their desire of vengeance against the Church of England ; and the same spirit is still burning in the breasts of those who profess to be the followers of the Non-conformists.

The author admits that a vast number of clergymen were subjected to the scrutiny of the committees of sequestration, during the early period of the Long Parliament. p. 175. But

he endeavours, in a subsequent portion of his volume, to prove that the clergy who were actually sequestrated were removed for gross immoralities. He assures us that the grossest crimes were proved against them by the evidence of several witnesses. This heavy accusation he rests on the authority of the notorious *White*, who published what he termed "*The First Centurie of Scandalous Ministers.*" Let us, however, quote his own words:—

"The disclosures made before the committee led to the ejection of a large number of the Episcopal clergy. After all the deductions which a calm investigation of the case may warrant, an impartial mind is compelled to acquiesce in the conviction, that the great body of the clergy at this time were notoriously disqualified for their high vocation."

Then speaking of *White's Centurie*, he adds:—

"It was the most effective course which could have been adopted, and must have served to refute a thousand calumnies that were in extensive circulation."

Still he is compelled to admit that some of the ejected clergy were pious men; though, as a body, he condemns them as immoral:—

"Personal virtues may have been opposed to public delinquency; and an honest zeal on behalf of the popular cause have enforced a vigour which every humane and christian mind must have regretted. It is in vain to judge of the proceedings of such a period by the rules which are applicable to calmer and more ordinary times." pp. 273, 275.

Our readers will observe that his charge of immorality rests on the authority of *White's Centurie*, one of the most infamous publications by which the press was ever disgraced. It is a publication on which no respectable writer would build so heinous a charge even against the most worthless of the human race. But this very book, "*The Centurie*," proves that the charge of immorality was unfounded, and that the real crime of the clergy was *malignancy*; for it is remarkable that, though the charge of immorality is alleged in each of the hundred cases, the grievous crime of *malignancy*, or opposition to the Parliament, is in every instance specified. Undoubtedly the committees were anxious to receive charges affecting the morals of the clergy, knowing that by blackening their characters they should weaken their influence among the people; but it was for *malignancy* that the ejections actually took place. It is pretended by Dr. Price that witnesses were examined on both sides, and that the accused were permitted to defend themselves from the charges lodged against them. That the committees professed to act

justly is not denied; but it is a fact, which admits not of contradiction, that the witnesses on behalf of the clergy were brow-beaten, while those on the opposite side, who in most cases were common informers and men of notorious characters, were encouraged by all those means to which malice and interest lead men to resort. Dr. Price even, while alleging the charge of immorality, feels that it could not generally be substantiated, as is evident from his own words:—

“The clergy, as a class of public officers deriving their maintenance from the State, were necessarily responsible to the legislature for the due discharge of their functions.” p. 278.

It is evident from this passage, that Dr. Price was convinced that the crime for which the clergy were removed was *malignancy*. In a note, our author alludes to Hall, Chillingworth, Walton, and Hales,—men who could not be charged with immoral conduct. After pretending to censure the Parliament for casting out such men, he observes:—

“Our sober judgment compels us to admit that even in the cases we have mentioned there are considerations which ought to modify, though they may not reverse, our decision. Let us be assured that the individuals named were free from the charge of aspersing the Parliament and of aiding the King, and we will consign their judges to unmitigated reprobation.” p. 279.

This extract is conceived in the very spirit of *White's Centurie*. Dr. Price will not exculpate even these honoured names, unless they were “free from the charge of aspersing the Parliament and of aiding the King.” It is tantamount to an admission that nothing could save a man if he was a *Malignant*, and that, consequently, *malignancy* was the cause of the numerous sequestrations of the Episcopal clergy. While on the one hand support of the Parliament was a virtue which “covered a multitude of sins,” on the other, *malignancy* was a crime of so dark a hue that nothing could save the man who became obnoxious to that heavy charge.

In all the Parliamentary ordinances for the sequestration of the clergy, the term *scandalous ministers* is adopted, in order that the belief might be induced that the ejections took place for offences against morality. In every parish bribes were held out to the parishioners to give evidence against their ministers. It would have been strange, therefore, if numbers of witnesses had not in every case made their appearance, since most parishes must have contained individuals who were ready to come forward against men by whom, perhaps, their vices had been rebuked. Dr. Price, however, finds it impossible to sustain the

charges which from the days of White, have been so often repeated.

The writer experiences no difficulty in settling that much-disputed point respecting the author of the civil war. According to his statement the odium of that transaction must rest on the head of Charles. He alludes to the royal proclamation in 1643, prohibiting the Parliamentary fasts, and commanding the second Friday in each month to be observed: and then adds, "but the royal cause was only slightly benefitted by the prayers of its supporters." p. 237. Does this gentleman believe that the justice of a cause is to be determined by ultimate success? If such is his opinion, then Charles I., in his judgment, was certainly the author of the civil war. A better judge than Dr. Price, and a more impartial writer, though his prejudices must naturally lead him to favour the cause of the Parliament, has declared that "war was inevitable when Hotham shut the gates of Hull against his sovereign."* Yet Dissenting writers, without any hesitation, charge the guilt of the war upon the king.

When Dr. Price approaches the Westminster Assembly, he labours hard to represent the Independents, who were termed the Dissenting Brethren, in as favourable a light as possible. Were it not for his hostility to the Church of England, we verily believe, from the manner in which he speaks of the Assembly, that its members would not find any favour in his sight. He cannot censure, nor can he applaud their proceedings; the former, because they assisted in pulling down the Church, the latter, because, being chiefly Presbyterians, they acted against his favourite notions of religious equality. But from this Assembly he ingeniously derives a profound argument against all ecclesiastical conventions. "The history of their transactions is the most conclusive argument which can be adduced against such clerical conventions acting on the command and restrained by the authority of the civil power." p. 262. We have been greatly amused by the difficulty which our author evidently experienced in this portion of his narrative. As a stern Independent he cannot approve of their constitution or of their proceedings, but as the enemy of the Church of England he cannot condemn the men who did so much towards her overthrow. Doubtless, in his estimation, their opposition to the Church of England is a redeeming feature in their character—that, indeed, which has prevented him from consigning them to the execration of his voluntary allies.

* *Hollam.*

With all his ingenuity and special pleading, the author has, on more than one occasion, exposed himself in this volume to the charge of gross inconsistency. Speaking of the Covenant, which we may observe in passing, is not severely censured, we suppose because it was levelled at the English Church, he remarks:—

“A large portion of the Episcopal clergy had been displaced, all the higher officers of the Church were deprived of authority, and the new men who officiated at the altar were averse from her ritual.” p. 287.

Is this consistent with his attempt in other places to diminish the number of the sequestered clergy! Thus is it that all partizans, in writing history, are betrayed by their prejudices into inconsistencies, which are avoided by the honest and impartial historian.

It has been stated already, that Charles is loaded by this gentleman with the guilt of the civil war. We cannot, therefore, feel surprised if the king finds no favour with this sturdy Independent. We pity, however, the man who could write the following:—

“His apologists have sought to entrap the sympathies of mankind by portraying his conduct in the glowing colours of poetry. The affectionate father, the virtuous monarch, the high-minded and devoted Christian, have been substituted for the intriguing, short-sighted, and pitiable Charles.” p. 400.

“It is not the province of the historian to pronounce on the future, or to limit the range of divine mercy. Charity will hope that the closing hours of a life distinguished by falsehood, tyranny, and other crimes, was visited by that benign and purifying power which alone can renovate the heart and prepare for everlasting peace.” p. 428.

Whatever may have been the failings of Charles I., he does not deserve the reproach so eagerly heaped upon him by this writer. None, even of the party scribes of the period, whose exaggerations might be excused, on the ground of excited feelings, have equalled the bitterness and the uncharitableness of the preceding extracts.

Although Dr. Price almost applauds the act of slaughtering the king, yet he is unwilling that the odium of that dark deed should rest upon his own party, the Independents. He endeavours, therefore, to remove from them the stigma which has ever since attached to that body; but without effect, since no sophistry will avail to make the Independents of that day appear guiltless of embruing their hands in the blood of their sovereign. See pp. 433-4. It is remarkable that the same tendencies are discoverable in the Independency of the present day. Yet our author's views of the House of Lords, quoted in a pre-

ceding page, be remembered ! Similar sentiments would also be entertained respecting the sovereign, should she act in opposition to the House of Commons, which he is pleased to designate the omnipotent branch of the legislature. To the same end do many of the actions of Dissenters tend. We do not mean to say that the sovereign would be deprived of life; but we assert that the principles laid down in this volume must, if carried out, issue in her dethronement, and the establishment of a republican government.

These observations are justified by our author's remarks on the measures contemplated subsequent to the king's death. It is not possible for us to notice all his extraordinary statements; but those which we are about to mention will prove that the preceding remarks are founded on truth. Almost all the acts of the so called Parliament, after the murder of the king, are approved, if not applauded, by Dr. Price. Of the attempt to abolish patronage he thus speaks:—

“It is a monstrous anomaly, that the right of imparting religious instruction to a people should be made a marketable article; and, as such, be transferred from hand to hand, on the ordinary principles of commercial dealings. It is no small honour to the men whom Cromwell summoned to meet at Whitehall, that they duly appreciated this system, and determined on its destruction. Their speedy dissolution prevented the accomplishment of their design, but history perpetuates the record of their enlightened scheme.” p. 503.

The mode of celebrating marriage is also approved by Dr. Price. It is well known that marriage was made a civil contract, that the banns were required to be published either in the market-place, or in the church, at the option of the parties, and that the ceremony, such as it was, consisting merely of the repetition of a few words, took place in the presence of a justice of the peace, without whose intervention the contract was not legal. Of this strange scheme, so revolting to all right feelings, Dr. Price thus expresses himself:—

“In severing the civil contract from the religious services with which individuals might think proper to associate it, the Parliament acted consistently with its own principles, and in harmony with the soundest policy. It was equally their duty, as legislators, to enforce the former, and to leave the latter to the voluntary arrangements of the parties concerned.” p. 505.

We hope that our reverend Doctor is satisfied with the scheme at present existing. Still we are greatly mistaken if the recent alteration in the Marriage Act is not calculated, more than almost any other measure of modern times, to show the weakness of

Dissent. How few are there who leave the church for the meeting-house or the superintendent's office ! Compared with the aggregate of marriages in the country, how very small is that select number of persons who refuse to be married as their fathers had been before them ! It may be proper to remark, in connection with this subject, that the Dissenting ministers appear ambitious of having it thought that *they* stand on the same ground in this matter with the clergy of the Church of England. We sometimes, for instance, read in the public papers the announcement of a marriage celebrated by the *Rev. Mr. So and So*, a Dissenting minister ; an announcement which is palpably false, since no Dissenting minister is authorised to marry. He may be present at the ceremony if he pleases ; but his presence is not required to render the contract valid. No marriage can take place out of the *Church*, except in the presence of the *Register* of the union in which the parties may reside. It is true that the marriage may be celebrated in a chapel ; but not by the minister. He has no more to do with the business than the Pope. The important person, whose presence the law renders necessary to the validity of the contract, is the aforesaid *Register*. Such is the case with all marriages not celebrated in the Church of England ; and yet some Dissenting preachers can put forth the glaring falsehood that certain parties are married by them. As it respects the clergy, the law remains unaltered. They can still, as heretofore, perform the marriage ceremony, and without the intervention of the officer from the Poor-law union. The returns prove that the old English feeling on this subject is as strong as ever, and that none but the rigid Dissenters are disposed to depart from the practice of our forefathers.

Cromwell is a greater favourite with Dr. Price than Charles I. Most of his measures are accordingly lauded. Much has been said about the *Triers* who were appointed by Cromwell to choose persons for the ministry in the churches. Many Presbyterian writers have spoken of them with great severity ; but with Dissenting writers they uniformly find much favour. Dr. Price adduces the case of Pococke to prove that, generally speaking, they acted with fairness, the influence of the least qualified being "tempered by the better spirit and more enlightened views of their associates." How he can adduce this case to prove that they generally acted fairly we cannot conceive, since it was one of the worst acts of the body. It is true that Pococke was spared ; but it is also true that he was saved with difficulty. Nor ought the *Triers* to have the credit of the act, when it is notorious that Pococke was saved from ejection only by the strong representations of Owen to Secretary Thurloe.

The number ejected by the *Triers*, according to Dr. Price, was "very small." It would indeed have been strange if many had been removed by this singular body. Let the circumstances of the country be for one moment considered. Ever since the commencement of the war, committees for *scandalous ministers* had been labouring to expel from the churches every clergyman who regarded the royal cause with favour. Almost every parish had been visited by these committees. How then was it possible for any suspected clergyman to escape? If, therefore, the *Triers* did little work, it was because their predecessors in the same line had left them little to do. The business had been already completed; and the *Triers* could only go over the same ground, seeking after those who might have escaped the vigilance of the sequestrating committees. Still the iniquity of the measure is not the least diminished by the smallness of the numbers who were actually ejected. Dr. Price tells us, with unblushing impudence, that—

"They carried forward the reforms achieved by the Long Parliament, and, on retiring from their vocation, left the benefices of the Church in the possession of men unsurpassed for religious zeal and ministerial diligence." p. 541.

We have already stated that Cromwell is a greater favourite with Dr. Price than Charles I. Our readers have seen how he speaks of that monarch's last hours: let them contrast his observations on Charles with the following remarks on Cromwell's death: "One thing is evident, he died with composure, in the solemn recognition of his responsibility, and in the utterance of fervent prayer for his people." p. 626.* How different is this language from that adopted by our author in speaking of the death of Charles I. ! Yet can there be a question respecting the comparative guilt of the two individuals? Hypocrite as Cromwell undoubtedly was, yet we do not find that he is censured by Dr. Price: and then, because he cannot evade the force of the evidence relative to the guilt of the Protector, he uses the language which we have just quoted, insinuating that he was not only free from hypocrisy, but that he enjoyed composure of mind, and was a man of fervent prayer. Disgraceful as are many portions of this volume, none are more so than those which relate to Charles I., and the Protector Cromwell. The man

* The Doctor does not speak in this strain of Charles, who was a legitimate sovereign. No; He does not speak of the *people* as the *king's people* ! But in describing Cromwell's last hours, he speaks of his *prayer for his people*, as though he had been their lawful governor, and not an ambitious *usurper*. How inconsistent are some men !

who could write with such an utter disregard to the truth of history, is undeserving of credit in any statement involving opinions at variance with those which he has himself adopted.

We shall close our remarks on this volume with some allusion to Congregationalism or Independency, as described by Dr. Price.

"The tendency of Congregationalism to isolate its members from each other, and thus to check the flow of Christian sympathy, and to diminish the moral force of the Church universal, has been frequently adduced by opponents in proof of its unfitness to become the *instrument of the conversion of the world*."

One would imagine that no man, in his sober senses, could make himself so ridiculous as to hazard such an assertion.

The voluntary principle to become the instrument of the conversion of the world! Prodigious! What a discovery! So there is no chance of the world's conversion till this glorious principle has free scope for action, by the removal of all impediments in the shape of a state religion or an established church. Ye legislators of England, how can ye continue to prevent the conversion of the world by interposing in favor of the Church of England! It is truly astonishing to find men penning such nonsense on such a subject.

It is a fact that many Independents possessed churches and received tithes during the Commonwealth; and this fact could not be passed over by our author.

"The fact (says he) is notorious, and cannot be reconciled with the principles of the parties in question. Independency is founded on the voluntary character of religion. This is the element in which it lives and moves and has its being. It is its universal and all pervading attribute, the simple but majestic doctrine which is lisped in its infancy, and the distinct enunciation of which constitutes the glory of its manhood. Is it therefore matter of surprise that any Congregationalists should so far have forgotten what was due to their own consistency as to have received the constrained support of their people." p. 639.

We know not what period Dr. Price would assign for the infancy of Independency; but from his observations in this passage we imagine that the time of the Commonwealth is intended. At all events, the system is not older than the period of the Brownists, who were the first Independents. Dr. Price, therefore, virtually acknowledges that Independency is a very different thing from Christianity. What other meaning can his words convey? He speaks of the infancy of Independency some 200 years since; whereas Christianity is more than 1800 years old: consequently, according to his own admission, his much lauded system is quite a new thing in the world, and therefore not the system

introduced by Christ and his apostles. The system is now in its prime, as the Doctor asserts: and we tell him that it will arrive at old age, and decay, before it has achieved the conversion of the world. In England the voluntary principle has ample scope; and yet what has it accomplished amidst our overgrown population? As an auxiliary it may be useful; but as the only system of religious instruction it would be lamentably defective. Were we, as a nation, left to the operations of Independency, we should soon sink into Popery, Socinianism, and Infidelity. It cannot be disputed that, from whatever cause, there is such a tendency in Dissent. This tendency, in our opinion, arises from the fact that, having neither articles, nor creeds, nor formularies, there is nothing to check the minister or people from going astray from the principles of the Gospel. The present state of Dissent corroborates our assertions. For are not the Dissenters more mindful of politics than of religion? Are they not more occupied with the creeds of visionary demagogues, than with the principles of the sacred volume? This is a fearful state of things; yet the picture is not overcharged. Our assertions rest on facts which cannot be disputed.

But we tell Dr. Price that his system, which has at length arrived at manhood, is novel and unscriptural. It is like the creed of Pope Pius IV., of very recent date; and to impose it upon the country, or, which is the same thing, to determine by legislative enactments that no other system should exist, would be an act of as great guilt as is the imposition of that creed on the Church of Rome. We have no faith in modern discoveries in religion. Had the system been destined to effect the conversion of the world, it would not have continued unknown during so many ages. According to the advocates of Independency, the world has been in error on the subject of religion from the times of the Apostles. It is, however, destitute of any foundation in scripture. It is surely a proof of the most consummate vanity in any man to come forward and proclaim to the world that a system which, according to his own confession, originated about the time of the civil wars, or a little before, is the one which is sanctioned by the sacred volume, as well as by apostolic practice, and is destined to effect the conversion of the world. From the days of St. Paul down to the present moment, the Church has been, according to Dr. Price, in error on the subject of church government: yet Independency was never heard of in the world before the seventeenth century! If any religious system is destitute of scripture foundation, it is that of Independency or Congregationalism. Its tendencies are towards disorder, confusion,

schism, heresy, and all those evils to which the Church of Christ has frequently been exposed : and we know that the Lord our God is not the author of confusion, but the God of order and of peace—of peace which is a consequence of order, since where disorder reigns peace can never be found.

ART. IV.—*Gleanings in Natural History.* By EDWARD JESSE, Esq., F.L.S., Surveyor of Her Majesty's Parks, Palaces, &c. New Edition, 12mo., 2 vols. London: Murray. 1838.

IT is delightful to turn aside for a brief space from the heat of political strife, and the perpetual round of change in which it seems to be the pleasure of certain parties in this country to involve not only themselves, but all around them, and to study the contents of these beautiful and instructive volumes. It is almost as refreshing to the moral sense, as the green oasis of the desert, which travellers describe in such brilliant colours, is to the physical sight. We are sure that no one can rise up from their perusal without feeling a wiser and a better man. It has long been our intention to devote a few pages of this journal to some considerations upon country life and country matters in general, and we hail with pleasure the appearance of a new edition of Mr. Jesse's work, that we may take an opportunity of placing it at the head of our article. Let not our readers imagine that we are going to write an essay upon natural history; far from it. Mr. Jesse's work, notwithstanding its title, has a much higher object in view than that would lead us to conceive. The anecdotes which he relates are brought forward not merely for the amusement of his readers, but as proofs of the goodness, benevolence, and wisdom of the Deity, and to impress upon their minds the absolute necessity and duty of exercising humanity and kindness towards the brute creation. But this is not all. His pages are occasionally enriched with illustrations drawn from holy writ, which are introduced in the most appropriate and unostentatious manner. Mr. Jesse has also given us, at the conclusion of his work, one or two chapters on the condition of the peasantry, and country life in general, which are filled with sound and excellent reflections. Indeed, both these and the whole of his work are full of that good old English feeling which, in other and more prosperous days, contributed to make England what it was before the dull realities, the cold calculations, of a reforming age had driven away true patriotism, and given, in its place, a

spirit assuming the same name, but content to display itself only in a series of unjust and cowardly attacks upon the most venerable and consecrated institutions of its native land, in a paltry and destructive economy, and in a restless and insatiate appetite for change. Such feelings as Mr. Jesse's we honour. We earnestly hope that the return to Conservative principles, which appears to be fast taking place throughout the length and breadth of the land, will induce a revival of those good old feelings, those *homely* sensibilities, which in past days distinguished that peculiar and time-honoured character, "the fine old English gentleman."

We have not the pleasure of Mr. Jesse's acquaintance, but, judging from his work, we should pronounce him to be a man of very acute observation, accompanied by the power of expressing its results in simple, clear, and occasionally beautiful language; and we should also say of him, that he was full of good and kindly feelings not only towards his fellow-creatures, but towards those inferior beings in the scale of creation, who, although they were placed at the disposal of man by the Deity, yet it cannot be doubted but that He who gave them to our use will exact a strict account of the manner in which they have been treated.

Of all the modes of life which man can pass, a country one is the most innocent, the most serene and peaceful, and, taking every thing into consideration, the most happy. It is the most calculated to promote our moral welfare, our spiritual improvement, and is at the same time most conducive to our physical health. Man was originally intended to pass such a life by his Maker. God, who has created all things, has in a more especial manner rendered visible the operations of his Almighty hand in the country. The different processes of vegetation, the changes of the seasons and the effects resulting from them—the decay and the revival of nature—the firmament above us, adorned with its innumerable bright and shining lights—the beautiful and verdant surface upon which we walk, enamelled with its flowers of various hues—the feathered inhabitants of the forest, the grove, and the plain, pouring forth their daily concert of joy and delight—these, and ten thousand other objects as beautiful, as varied, and as sublime, all attest the existence of that Great Being who is above all, and in all, and through all, and by whom all things consist, and stamp in characters of life and light His omnipotence, benevolence, and wisdom. And where, it may well be asked, can these marks of an all-wise and superintending Providence be so well observed, or so thankfully acknowledged, as amidst the quietness and retirement of a country

life? The dweller in the city is so surrounded by the works of his fellow-men, and is so much accustomed to regard the art and skill of the creature, that he is apt to forget, and, to his shame be it spoken, to disregard the omnipotence of the Creator. The din of the crowded street, the noise and excitement of the public assembly, the bustle and hurry of commerce and amusement, too often, alas! repress that still small voice within, which, if permitted to speak, would tell us of the Great Source from whence all blessings flow. But the case is far different in the country. There, every individual, whatever may be his station, is almost insensibly affected by the softening and ameliorating influence of the scenes and objects which surround him. The most humble peasant who pursues his labours in the fields, however unenlightened by education, cannot fail to draw conclusions from the very occupation in which he is engaged, favourable to his condition as an accountable being. He cannot cast the grain with his hand over the ploughed field, and watch its progress from a small and tender green shoot until it becomes a stately plant, ripened for the sickle, without being led sometimes to consider within himself who has given this quickening power to so small a grain, which enables it to grow to a tall stem? When he goes forth to his daily task in the morning, and returns at the even-tide, he beholds the great luminaries of the sky shining forth in all their brightness and glory—the thunder storm, the rain, and the sheeted lightning, the torrent descending from the mountain's side, and the snow-wreath enveloping all around with its fleecy covering—sights and scenes which he is accustomed to witness at different periods of the year—all these induce him to reflect, and lead him up to Him “who hath given life and light to all, who causeth his sun to shine and his rain to fall on the just and on the unjust.” But if the uneducated individual who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is liable to be so affected by the scenes and operations of nature, how much greater will be the effect produced upon the educated man, who has had his feelings and sensibilities heightened, and his powers of observation drawn forth and improved by intellectual culture!

We are told in holy writ that Isaac went forth to meditate at even-tide. We cannot doubt but that the subject of his meditations was the goodness, the benevolence, and the wisdom of God, as displayed in the works of the creation. And who is there who possesses a cultivated mind, and a heart attuned to feeling, who does not sometimes experience a wish to imitate the example of the patriarch of old, and go forth and reflect amidst the quiet and silence of the country? Who is there who

has not felt disposed, at one period or other in his life, to withdraw from his usual occupation, and it may be even from the society of his own household, to separate himself for a brief space from this world and its concerns, and to allow his thoughts to fix themselves on higher, and purer, and holier things? But there are seasons of the year when this desire of which we have spoken comes over the mind with greater power than at others. In the freshness and genial air of a spring morning, when vegetable life is again bursting forth—in the brightness of a cloudless summer's day, when the whole atmosphere is perfumed with sweets, and the eye as well as the ear is saluted with sights and sounds of happiness and joy—in the mild and sober glories of a serene autumn afternoon, that sweet season which has been so beautifully described as the "Sabbath of the year,"—who has not at such seasons as these felt a train of new and unknown sensations pass through his mind, purified from all taint of earthly dross, which raise him for the time above this nether world and its perishable concerns, make him forget that he is a child of earth, and tell him, in characters which can never be effaced, that he is an inheritor of heaven. Who has not at such a time felt his heart lifted up to the Maker and Giver of all good, and experienced a more humble gratitude for Divine mercies, a more unhesitating belief, and a more unquestioning faith in the truths of revelation? Who has not returned from such meditations as these, to his former occupations, a wiser, a better, and a happier man?

Let us not be deemed enthusiastic in what we have said by the inhabitant of the city and crowded town. It does not follow because he who is accustomed only to look forth on huge and unsightly masses of brick and mortar, and who it may be is confined within the close bounds of the street or square, has a mind unattuned to such pure and elevating thoughts, that those who enjoy a purer sky, and live amidst the beautiful scenes of nature, should possess a spirit equally cold and earthly.

We shall here extract some very pleasing passages from Mr. Jesse's work on the pleasures of a country life, and on the thoughts and reflections incidental to the scenes and objects belonging to it. These passages occur at intervals in the second volume, but as they are all more or less connected with each other as to subject, we shall place them together, only preserving the order in which they stand:—

"I invariably experience a variety of sensations when I survey the heavens on a calm, clear night, about the end of the month of May. I can then inhale the sweets of the wood-bine and other flowers, whose

should abandon their estates and mansions, and those numerous persons who look up to them for protection and support, and spend the greater part of their time in the metropolis, the crowded watering-place, or fritter it away in travelling over the continent, residing now at Paris, now at Rome or Florence, flying from one picture gallery to another, from the studio of the painter to the work-room of the sculptor, spending the income derived from their estates at home amongst persons, frequently worthless and unprincipled, who only laugh at their folly and profusion, and finally undermining the religious principles of themselves and their families, and gradually losing all those good feelings—prejudices, we suppose, this *liberal* age will call them—which once made the English character so respectable and eminent? By the bye, we believe an eminent northern philosopher, one of the shining lights of the school of Political Economy, delivered it as his opinion, or at least something amounting to it, on some particular occasion before a committee, that the rent of an estate in an English county, spent by its proprietor on the continent, was equally beneficial to the natives of that same county as if it had been consumed among them. We are not aware that we have overcharged this statement, certainly not intentionally. It was undoubtedly a very luminous effusion, quite worthy of the politico-economico-school, and as such deserves to be recorded for the benefit of posterity. Various reasons will doubtless be alleged in answer to this question. Some will plead economy, others a desire for amusement and information, or a wish to change the scene. Now, certainly, the first of these reasons will scarcely apply to the case of those who visit the metropolis, however well it may to the frequenters of a watering-place. With regard to the others we shall speak afterwards. But the most blameable class is composed of those who bring forward these reasons as an excuse for a residence on the continent. In the case of some persons, undoubtedly, a desire for retrenchment may be a legitimate plea, where it has not been caused by their own extravagance; but we may very well doubt whether economy is an end always attained by these persons. Is the removal and subsequent long journey by sea and land, of a large family, perhaps, to be reckoned as nothing? Is the rent of a house fit for the reception of such a family nothing? and, moreover, it does not necessarily follow that the English mansion which has been abandoned should be let. Are the numberless new and unforeseen expenses attendant upon a residence in a foreign country to be reckoned as nothing? People may talk as they like of the cheapness of foreign lands, but

we are inclined to think that this is only to be found in remote and unfrequented parts, certainly not in the greater towns, which are generally chosen as places of residence by our countrymen. "But," say these persons, "education is so cheap abroad." This may, perhaps, be granted: but what is the nature of such an education?—what is the character of the persons by whom it is conducted?—what sort of respect do they entertain for religion? and what kind of religious precepts, either directly or indirectly, are they likely to impart to their pupils? What lessons, moreover, are those same pupils likely to derive from observing an almost total desecration of the Sabbath, from perceiving a very general disregard and indifference on all matters connected with their moral and spiritual welfare in those around them? The fruits of such a system may be already perceived amongst the youth of the present day. Many of these appear to be ambitious not only to forget their native language, but what is far more important, the habits, manners, customs, modes of thinking and acting peculiar to their native land—in a word, those pure and unadulterated rules of morals and religion by whose guidance alone man can hope to walk secure from falling.

Again, with regard to the pleas of amusement, information, or a wish to change the scene, which are alleged by persons who abandon their country mansions and estates. Is amusement, or even information, with the exception of that which relates to our spiritual condition, the sole object for which man was created? Was he sent into this world to pass his time in that manner which seems most pleasing to himself? Was he intended to fritter away his existence in frivolous pursuits, trifling and unmeaning recreations and pleasures, which, however innocent they may be in themselves, become, when pursued to excess, dangerous to our moral welfare and sinful in the sight of God?

Is there to be no space left for serious thought? Is there to be no room for grave and sober occupations? Are there no important duties to be fulfilled? Are there no higher interests than those which belong to the passing scene to be attended to? Are not certain talents, whether mental endowments, wealth, power, influence, entrusted to each individual, for the use or abuse of which he will be called to a strict account by his Creator? Have we not duties to perform, not to ourselves alone, nor even to our relatives, our friends, our acquaintances, but to our neighbours, our dependents, our country? And how are these to be fulfilled, if we desert our proper sphere, where it was intended that our powers and energies should be called into action? If these matters press more heavily on any one class

than another, it is surely on the owners of landed property. These, in addition to the responsibilities under which every possessor of wealth is laid, have numerous human beings looking up to them for assistance, upon their treatment of whom depends, it may be, whether they will become useful, industrious, virtuous, and religious members of society, or the direct reverse. Let not such persons flatter themselves with the idea that the clergyman of the parish (that ill-used, and yet most necessary character, who had need to possess almost superhuman strength and energy to enable him to bear up under the various burthens imposed upon him from every quarter) can watch alone and without assistance over the moral and religious welfare of the poor. True it is, he will do his utmost, and earnestly and zealously will he do it: but in order to give due effect to the instructions of their spiritual pastor, it is necessary that the poor should be cheered by the presence, the example, and the influence of their temporal superior, that they should be aided by him in their wants and necessities, checked and controlled by his authority, and encouraged by his favour and approbation. In short, it is necessary that he should go hand in hand with the clergyman of his parish in his endeavours to improve the temporal and spiritual condition of his flock, otherwise those endeavours can scarcely be expected to produce their proper results. The best of us are but weak and fallible beings; how then can we expect that those who earn their daily bread by their daily labour will listen so attentively to the instructions of religion, if they perceive those persons to whom they are taught to look up, who are placed above them by education, station, and fortune, heedless, it may be, or negligent of the duties which our blessed religion prescribes to the affluent, not only of looking after the earthly condition of their poorer brethren, but of bearing a part also in bringing about their mental and religious improvement?

But in addition to these real or imaginary reasons which we have mentioned as operating to separate the owners of landed property from those districts which claim their presence, and which, as they depend on the will or caprice of the individual, may be termed voluntary, there are others almost wholly external, and in a certain degree compulsory, which, it is much to be feared, produce no inconsiderable influence upon the fast increasing evil of English absenteeism. What these are we will endeavour to explain; but in order to do so, we must go back a little. Every one who is disposed to consider the state of affairs during the last few years more particularly, dispassion-

ately and without prejudice, cannot fail to observe that very great changes have been produced, affecting every class and condition, and perhaps no one more than the country gentleman of moderate fortune—a class of men most estimable, most truly respectable, most really dignified, most thoroughly English, and which has contributed, more than any other, to impart a peculiar character to our native country, and to give a healthful and improving tone to society in general. And yet this is the class which a certain party in this country, during the period alluded to, has shown a continual purpose to depreciate, to lower in the public estimation, and to deprive of its advantages and privileges. If it is asked how this can be proved, we answer, by reference to the periodical publications connected with the self-styled *liberal* party, the speeches delivered at public meetings by individual members of the same party, and their writings in general, and even sentiments as expressed in conversation. In all of these it is easy to perceive a desire to indulge in ridicule of this meritorious class, a wish to represent the members of it as inferior to their fellow-men in general information and knowledge of the world, and, what is still worse, occasionally an attempt to excite the bad feelings of the lower orders against them, by holding them up to the public view as unwilling or unable to administer justice in their magisterial capacity, denominating them, in this relation, among other invidious terms, as the “great unpaid !” a term of reproach, by the bye, coming with singular infelicity from the liberal party, preaching up economy in theory as they do on every occasion, and yet taking excellent care, as far as they themselves are concerned, not to accept any office without a very sufficient remuneration !

But this ungenerous spirit, unfortunately, is not confined to words and writings only, it has exhibited itself also in actions. If we examine many of the measures which have been brought about during the period to which we have alluded, we shall find this insidious feeling displaying itself in most of them, more or less. For instance, the new Poor-law has removed out of the hands of the country magistrates a considerable portion of the jurisdiction which they were accustomed to exercise, and has transferred it to a class of persons very unfit, from the nature of their education and their station in life, to exercise the onerous duties intrusted to them. Luckily, for the good of the country, the country gentlemen, in many instances, have undertaken the office of guardians of the poor, and have, by so doing, at the same time shown their willingness to carry out a law when passed, which they had previously disapproved of, and been instrumental,

also, in rescuing it, as far as their power extended, from the obloquy in which it had been involved. Such a result as this, possibly, was not contemplated: perhaps it was imagined that the burthensome and fatiguing nature of the duties belonging to the office would deter the country gentlemen, in many cases, from undertaking it, and that they would thus gradually be deprived of a great part of their legitimate influence.

Another striking example of the same feeling may be perceived in the mode in which the numerous railways have been carried out, which have been suffered to spread themselves over the country, and which, if ever brought to completion, will produce such a change not only in its appearance, but in the manners, habits, and even morals of society, as few persons contemplate at the present moment. These modes of communication have generally, we believe, been promoted by the liberal party, and the consequence is, that a total disregard of the interests, feelings, and comfort of the landed proprietors has been exhibited; and all these have been sacrificed in order to gratify the chimerical schemes of a few interested speculators. Perhaps we shall be considered visionary in making these observations; but let any one regard attentively the progress of a railroad to completion, together with its attendant circumstances, and he will soon be convinced that we are not far from the truth. He will see a huge and unsightly mound of earth passing through a gentleman's estate, frequently through his pleasure grounds, sometimes even across his very garden, totally excluding his prospect, and fixing an impassable barrier between different portions of his property; for although arches and bridges are built under and over these roads, to facilitate communication between the country on each side, we must recollect that these occur only at intervals, so that a person wishing to pass from one field to another would be obliged to go round some distance, instead of crossing directly from one to the other as before. To persons who are addicted to field sports—and although such a consideration may appear trifling to some individuals, and they may affect to look down with contempt on those who are engaged in such amusements, we are to recollect that they are pursued by a great many of our countrymen, who are most respectable and most estimable in every point of view, and who derive from them not only recreation, but also health—this species of road will present an almost insurmountable obstacle. Indeed, we happen to know that a circumstance has already occurred which proves the truth of what we have said. A celebrated hunt has abandoned its original line of country, much to the chagrin of the surrounding

neighbourhood, in consequence of a railroad having been carried across it. We are not interested ourselves in the question, as we are not sportsmen. We dare say, however, that what we have said will be laughed at by the enlightened wiseacres who talk of the march of science and the necessity of increasing communication in a country which is already intersected by roads at every point. They will, perhaps, tell us that the amusements, the prospects, and the comforts of a few country gentlemen are of no importance whatever, when weighed in the balance with the general utility and an improved communication between different parts of the nation: they will talk a great deal about vested interests and private rights giving way to great public measures, and will indulge in a great deal of the same nonsensical kind of jargon. This is all very fine talking, but it is not quite sufficient to convince us of the honesty, the justice, or equity of cutting through a gentleman's estate, destroying his garden, or even pulling down his house, in order to form a private road monopoly, from which the public are excluded, for the benefit of a company of speculators, in a line of country where, probably, a turnpike road already existed; nor are we quite so much enlightened as to think it perfectly right and fitting that the comforts, the interests, the amusements even, and the old associations of the country gentlemen of England, should be destroyed, in order that a few merchants' and lawyers' clerks, hardwaremen, and bagmen, from Birmingham and Sheffield, and others of a like class, should reach their journey's end two or three hours earlier: for we must recollect that this new mode of travelling is by no means likely to be used by people in general. We are sick of the LIBERAL cant of the present day; which betrays its gross inconsistency, injustice, and partiality at every other word it utters. How otherwise would it so constantly talk of promoting the general utility, and yet concoct all its schemes for the good of one class alone? Or how else would it express its regard for the public welfare, and at the same time show by its actions that it consults the advantage of the trading portion of the community alone?

We cannot help drawing the conclusion, that many individuals in the class which we have mentioned, the country gentlemen, namely, have been induced to feel distaste towards the sphere of life in which they move by these and similar circumstances, and have finally been persuaded to abandon the halls of their forefathers and the fair fields which called them master, and to betake themselves, either for a time or altogether, to the sea-side, the metropolis, or the continent. Such a result as this cannot

be too deeply deplored. Any circumstance or combination of circumstances which tends to remove the country gentleman from his mansion and estate, not only withdraws a large portion of the circulating medium from the district in which it has hitherto been spent, but also deprives the neighbourhood of a humanizing and a civilizing example; the poor of a protector to whom they could look up for support and assistance in their wants and distresses; the county of a patron for its innocent amusements and relaxations, its institutions and improvements; and, finally, the country at large of an individual who formed one of the connecting links between the lower orders and the government, and constituted in his own person one of the firmest pillars of the British throne.

We should like to know in what part of the world a similar body of men to this meritorious class could be found, willing and ready to perform so many and such multifarious duties without any salary whatever? Where could persons be found ready to undertake the arduous and responsible offices of sheriffs, justices of the peace, deputy-lieutenants, guardians of the poor, commissioners of taxes and turnpikes, officers of yeomanry, &c., not only without receiving any remuneration, but very often at a large pecuniary sacrifice, and sometimes even at the expence of much obloquy and reproach? It may be very fine, undoubtedly, for persons, who betray by the arguments and reasons which they use that they know nothing at all about the matter, to talk of the benefits and advantages of paid magistrates; of course it must be much more economical to the country in general, and more advantageous to the county or district in particular, for a briefless barrister to be sent down from London at a salary of 800*l.* per annum, and to be placed in some village which he has never seen before, there to act as a magistrate, than for a gentleman of the county to fill the same office gratuitously! Doubtless such a person must be more independent in character, less likely to be subservient to the minister of the day, inasmuch as he only receives his salary from him, he must, of course, know more about the manners, habits, and feelings of the people of his district, than a gentleman of independent property, who has lived all his life in the neighbourhood where he exercises his magisterial office, and is consequently well acquainted with the manners and habits, the names and persons, of his neighbours of every degree! —a species of knowledge which, our readers need not be told, is essential to the holder of such a situation, as it enables him to compose, by conciliating measures, those differences which a mere legal functionary would consider as requiring to be dealt with by the sterner enforcements of the law. Evil will be the

day when the country gentlemen of England shall cease, even in part, to administer gratuitous justice to their countrymen. Extensive and numerous as are the changes which are continually taking place in this land, once distinguished for the permanent character of its institutions, such an one as this would be, we can never contemplate as likely to occur. As it is, we are more than enough infected with continental manners and continental usages, without importing, by way of addition—improvement, we suppose the *liberals* would call it—the system of salaried magistrates into the rural administration of England.

We would earnestly implore the country gentlemen of England, as they value their own respectability and happiness, and as they regard the welfare of their native land, to pause before they desert their ancestral halls. If ever there was a time when their presence was most urgently demanded that time is the present hour. A spirit of discontent and dissatisfaction amongst the peasantry in some districts of the country appears to be in a course of excitement. A set of wicked and desperate men, it seems, are travelling about the land, endeavouring to stir up and inflame the minds of the agricultural labourers against their employers, and to form them into combinations, ostensibly for the purpose of obtaining an increase of wages, but in reality, no doubt, at least if we are to judge from the reported speeches at meetings, to promote disorder, confusion, and revolution. In order that the plots of these conspirators against the loyalty and happiness of their countrymen, and the safety of the state, should be counteracted and checked whilst yet only in the bud, it is imperatively necessary that those whose station gives them such power should be at their proper posts, should exercise a continual watchfulness, a vigilant attention over these workings and heavings of the scum of sedition and treason. Let them not suppose, as it has been sometimes represented, that the feelings of respect and regard which were entertained of old by the peasantry towards their local superiors are passed away,—far from it. Such feelings as these are hereditary, and require only to be properly fostered and encouraged to exhibit themselves as strongly as ever. We would advise them, therefore, whenever the manifestations of such a spirit as we have alluded to begin to develope themselves, or there is reason to suppose that any individuals of the kind we have mentioned are about to make their appearance in the district with which they are connected, to go about amongst their poorer neighbours—to talk with them calmly, quietly, but firmly—to tell them who and what these persons are, and what is the real character of the objects they are

desirous to accomplish—to represent to them the inevitable effects which must follow from their suffering themselves to be seduced by the falsehoods of these individuals, who would make use of them as tools to effect their detestable schemes, and in the hour of danger would abandon them to their fate—to reason with them on the impolicy of their proceedings in a worldly point of view—to tell them that their masters, instead of being more inclined to increase their wages, will be only exasperated against them by their disorderly and violent conduct, and, finally, to state to them boldly and openly the fatal consequences, the disgrace and punishment, which must follow from any overt act on their part against the laws of their country. But when this has been done, when the right path has been pointed out to them, and they have shown a disposition to follow it, let it not be thought that enough has been accomplished, and that they may be left to themselves. The same watchful superintendence should be exercised over their conduct, a more careful attention than before should be employed to promote their comfort and happiness, and they should still be visited in their own homes. And, after all, as we have always thought, this is the great secret by which the connection between the higher and the lower orders in the country is to be kept up, by which a considerate regard and a charitable sympathy on the one side, and on the other an affectionate respect and a cheerful obedience are to be maintained and preserved. The rich must follow the poor into their cottages, must make themselves acquainted with their wants and necessities, must learn from their own lips the little history of the weal and woe of themselves and their families: in short, they must convince them that they do not think it sufficient to give them pecuniary relief, but that they feel an interest in their progress, and do not look with indifference on the details of their labours and proceedings. But why are we giving unnecessary advice? Why are we explaining their duty to persons who perform it so cheerfully, so willingly, who are so ready on all occasions to visit and relieve their poorer neighbours as the country gentlemen of England? Our advice and our explanations of duty are not addressed to the resident proprietors, for they, we are confident, will perform their part; but to the non-resident, and to those who are about or inclined to exchange their ancient halls and their beautiful fields for a foreign land: to such we say, as our parting exhortation, follow the poor man to his home, pay that attention to the cultivation of his temporal character which the clergyman of every parish in the kingdom renders continually and unceasingly to his improvement, both as a temporal and spiritual being.

ART. V.—*Portrait of an English Churchman.* By the Rev. William Gresley, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

THERE is no character more to be respected and valued than that of an English Clergyman. Yet, in the present day, by the ignorant and unthinking, his services are considered useless, and at times intrusive. It is to be expected that, among so large a body of men, many are to be found who by no means exhibit to the character of what a clergyman ought to be; but, taking that body as a whole, it is generally acknowledged, even by our bitterest enemies, that no other class of men can surpass or equal the clergy in the purity of their lives, in learning, in emulation, in doing good, and in a fervent desire to extend the kingdom of God upon the earth. A clergyman is a public character: whether his ministrations be marked in the pulpit, or in his parochial duties, there is the same evidence of the one great object he has in view, the same desire to bring about much good, and the same disinterested labour and love, which belong to no other man, whatsoever may be his calling. When a man enters the Church, his work is generally confined to some village curacy, beyond which he has oftentimes no hope; with his scanty pittance, we see him comparatively happy amid his professional duties: he feeds upon the consolation he administers to others—he is nourished by the bread that daily comes from heaven, which enables him to impart the same blessing to his poorer brethren. What other man could endure his life? With habits, with ideas, with occupations, far superior to the majority of his parishioners, he is transplanted from his college or his home to take up his abode in a strange land, oftentimes among an ignorant and overbearing set of people, hostile to the Establishment, opposed to all the good he is desirous to effect, and at variance among themselves. Yet is he contented: he is satisfied with his condition, because he is labouring as his Master laboured before him; he is imparting good to his fellow-men, and he is spiritualizing his flock upon the earth, that they may be found within the pale of the Christian Church in Heaven. Yet, with all his comparative happiness, he peculiarly claims a pity which we cannot fail to bestow. On the Sunday he may deliver the good tidings and preach consolation to the distressed—he may stamp upon the foreheads of the little children the cross of Christ crucified, and admit them into his Holy Church—he may perform the marriage rite, and call down the blessing of heaven on those so united—he may visit the dying, and present to his eye of faith that scene of im-

mortal glory which lies far beyond the grave,—he may comfort the mourner with those words of eternal life which cannot fail to give a warmth to the soul and a cheering to the heart, as the melancholy appendages of the death-chamber have nought about them but misery to offer: he may do all this in serenity and in truth. But his reward in this world is too often an ungrateful return for his services, the hateful scorn of the wicked, or the opprobrious taunt of the unthinking. Yes, too often does he thus return to his lowly dwelling, at the close of every Sabbath as it rolls its hallowed hours into the abyss of time, forgotten by the sons and daughters of men, or only remembered to be ridiculed and scandalized. But his God has not forsaken him: his good deeds are entered in that heavenly registry which shall never decay, and at the distribution of rewards his will be allowed in proportion to the increase of that talent which is confided to his spiritual keeping.

We do not make these observations to discourage the laudable attempts which should be made towards attaining eminence in the Church. Temporal rewards for long and faithful service are the Christian minister's temporal due. But every one should endeavour to rise in his profession, for the more indefatigable a man is the more deserving is he of a larger field and harvest. With respect to the Church, though there are many exceptions, there is no profession, perhaps, in which men stand so ill a chance of having their labours crowned with success and reward. How many poor but faithful men have died in comparative obscurity, how many are now living who have borne the heat and labour of the day, with large families unprovided for, who have exercised their christian ministry to the honouring of Jehovah, and, consequently, who have deserved better from the bishops and patrons, whose object should be to encourage the faithful ministers of Christ. We little know the existing wretchedness of many of the clergy. The generality of clergymen, however, are regarded as a wealthy race, and so they may be, as a body; but how often does that wealth, speaking individually, proceed, not from the Church, but from their own private sources, without which these men would be helpless, and without that power of doing good which should be extended to their poor parishioners. But we ask not for pity, we only require for the clergy that which they have a right to demand—RESPECT.

The work which we have placed at the head of this article rather solicits a review than any essay upon the present position of the clergy, however we may be inclined to write one. *The Portrait of an English Churchman* is a title which considerably prepossessed us in favour of the work to which it is appended;

but we have been rather disappointed in the full satisfaction we anticipated to derive from an examination of its contents. The volume, as the preface says, is an attempt to paint the feelings, habits of thought, and mode of acting, which naturally flow from a sincere attachment to the system of belief and discipline adopted in our Church. The first chapter contains an account of the youthful difficulties of Arthur Ridley; but if youth had no greater difficulties to contend against than he had, we do not think that he would receive commiseration from his fellows. His greatest misfortune appears to have been the loss of his father; but that father, who had been his early and principal instructor, had well grounded him in religious principles, which enabled him to resist temptation and the dangers to which every youth is exposed. The second chapter treats of the Fathers of the Church, and the argument which is adduced in favour of studying the Fathers clearly shows to us that the author is inclined to a party which has lately sprung up at Oxford. We do not, as before we have had occasion to observe, disapprove of studying the Fathers, but we do warmly disapprove of the fallible word of man being set up as a standard against the Word of God, which we are told cannot err. Ridley says very little in this chapter upon the observations of his friend Herbert, upon whom he has just called, and whose study is covered with "dusty tomes," "crabbed volumes," as Ridley calls them. It is very true that Ridley asks his friend why he does not prefer the Bible and the modern commentators? But, instead of insisting on the Bible as the foundation of the truest wisdom, he allows his opponent to convince him of the high value of tradition, and declares that his reasoning is sound, and that he only objects to it for the sake of having Herbert's answer. This is rather too bold: if we are to have dialogues, let the Bible, in distinction to all tradition, be the most prominent subject of discourse. Let it be shown that valuable as tradition may be, as an external evidence, the Bible is so mighty in itself that it does not absolutely require the aid of tradition to prove its verity.

The third chapter, upon *the one Catholic and Apostolic Church*, is not quite so full as it might, or rather ought, to have been upon so momentous a subject. The following quotation gives admirable advice to those who are disturbing the peace of our Church by causing divisions among us:—

"It is one of the fundamental principles in the Gospel that there must be no schism or division in the body of the Church. No crime is more reprehended in Scripture than the sin of rending the body of the Church. And this, no doubt, is the reason why we find so pro-

minent a place occupied in the ancient creed by the doctrine of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Our wish, at present, is far from recommending the author of this work to apply his own advice to himself; but if he appear again before the public we would recommend him to be cautious. Young as he is in the doctrines of the New Theological School, he may advance too rapidly and heedlessly in opinions which he, in former years, as an orthodox clergyman, would have spurned. When Mr. Gresley talks of the *Tracts for the Times* "supplying principles of union, for want of which the Church was in *the act of falling to pieces*," he talks very unlike a fearless churchman, or one who believes that the Church of Christ shall never be destroyed, no not even by the *gates of hell*.

The fourth chapter is upon *Schism*: the first remarkable passage we observe is the following:—

"If Scripture admit of different interpretations, then the best help to guide us to the right meaning is the testimony and practice of the first Christians, and in the case before us, the practice of the ancient Church fully corroborates the view which I have taken."

Now we deny that Scripture does admit of different interpretations: the denial may be a bold one, and appear, at first, somewhat strange; but we can support our opinion. Because different sects advance different interpretations of Scripture, it does not follow that the various interpretations are correct, much less that the passages really admit of those interpretations: in fact, there can be only one correct interpretation, and all that are at variance with other parts of Scripture must be incorrect. One part of Scripture generally interprets another; and where this is not the case, we commonly have analogy of doctrine to guide us. But our author admits of different interpretations, and prefers "the testimony and practice of the first Christians" to Scripture itself, which is so plain that he that runneth may read. And poor Ridley has become so far a convert as to declare thus: "I confess that you have described with tolerable exactness what has been the drift of my thoughts." How kindly anticipated! Will Mr. Gresley, in a future edition of this work, inform us what he means by the term *primo-primitive*? The following passage also requires an explanation:

"Church matters are so confused and involved, that it seems impossible to draw the precise line of demarcation between the Church and separatists."

The following passage also, in the fifth chapter, requires an explanation:—

“The Church consists of laity as well as clergy; and in its arrangements lay influence is perfectly legitimate.”

In another passage, in the same chapter, Mr. Gresley writes thus :—

“There are more than ten thousand *stations* in the land, from which is proclaimed aloud, every seventh day, that there is a God above, a Providence, a judgment, a heaven, a hell.”

Stations? Are our churches converted into stations? The term is used by the Roman Catholics.* In the same chapter our author asserts “that almost any religion is better than none.” We question very much whether or not it would be better for man to remain in total ignorance of the love-giving tenets of Christianity, or to embrace the errors of the Romish Church: our author may be correct, but our Bible says “that the heathen are a law unto themselves;” meaning, that while there is a hope of salvation to the ignorant, but little is held out to that man who does not hold fast that form of sound doctrine which was once delivered to the saints, and which has been offered for his acceptance, and if rejected, will subject him to the threatened penalties of such a rejection.

In noticing some of the points forced upon us by our critical office, our readers, we fear, will imagine that we are desirous of wholly condemning the work before us. We should be sorry to leave that impression. It merely requires to be read with caution; if so read, the good which it contains will easily be separated from the objectionable matter. Like many others, it has its faults; but taken as a whole it is admirable. Its imperfections chiefly arise from the opinions which the author has imbibed from the *Oxford Tract* party, which, at times, he most conspicuously exhibits, though he appears desirous to conceal them.

But we must hasten to introduce into our pages two or three quotations which we consider the most worthy of attention. The chapter entitled “The Churchman in Society” is full of interest, and contains some incontrovertible arguments upon the *forms* of the Establishment.

Lord Waverley is supposed to ask “What can it signify whether a clergyman wears a surplice or not, provided his dress is decent; or whether the Church be governed by bishops, or in any other way, provided it is well governed?” The following answer by Herbert is conclusive:—

“You say that forms are unimportant, and that Christians ought not to dispute about them. The position that I would maintain is, *that*

See the *Roman Catholic Directory* for 1839.

some forms are very important, and that with regard to those which are not so, the sin of separation from the Church, on account of them, is great in proportion to their unimportance.

“Take the forms mentioned—Episcopacy and the use of the surplice. It is at once evident that one is a grave and serious question, and the other, in itself, of little moment. But it is clearly illogical to class them both together as forms, and to argue or infer that because Christians have too pertinaciously disputed about the use of the surplice, therefore they ought to be indifferent about Episcopacy. By way of illustration, let us suppose the case of an army. It will be evident that some forms are essential to its very constitution, and others are non-essential. It is, I presume, essential that every division of an army should be under one commander, and that a good understanding and mutual correspondences should be kept up between the different divisions, and that there should be a regular gradation of officers, who shall not be liable to be cashiered by those whom they command. Without these, an army could not be efficient. So neither could the Church, unless each diocese has its regular head and due gradation of subordinate ministers, and a proper connection be maintained throughout the whole body.

“But again, it is evident that in the army it is of little moment what is the colour or particular cut of the uniform, nay, the uniform may vary according to the fashion of the day. The powdered and pig-tailed grenadiers, under General Wolfe, maintained the honour of England as well as the mustachioed dragoons of Waterloo. So, as you say, it is very unimportant whether a clergyman wears a black gown or a white one. He may preach and pray equally well in one as in the other.

“Yet these details, though unimportant in themselves, *become important when they have been established by competent authority.* If, for instance, some of the soldiers in a regiment took it into their heads to appear on parade in blue uniform, when all the rest wore red, they would justly subject themselves to punishment, not because their uniform was worse than that of the rest, but for disobeying orders. So, if the Church of any nation orders that the service should be performed in a surplice, it would be highly blameable in any individual minister to object to such an arrangement,—not because a white gown is better than a black one, but because it would be a needless deviation from uniformity.

“And, in proportion to the triviality of the matter, just so would be the perverseness of him who separated from the Church on account of it. Dissenters, you will say, differ from the Church on some trifling forms; why, then, do they separate themselves from us? If the forms are trifling, why do they not yield them for the sake of unity, or at least remain in our communion? It is not so much for the difference of form that we blame them, as for their separation from the Church, which ought to be one and undivided.

“However, we have seen that Episcopacy is not a mere question of forms. Episcopacy, and a due gradation of the ministry, are of as vital importance to the well being of the Church as a good staff to the effi-

ency of the army. And this is putting the question on the very lowest ground; because, looking at Scripture and at Church history, we can prove that the Episcopal form was that in which the Church was founded by the Apostles, and in which it continued for fifteen hundred years. *The bishops are the only order of the ministry who have received divine authority to ordain, and therefore without their ordination no minister can prove his right to preach the Gospel or to administer the sacraments.* Therefore, we are bound to maintain the Episcopal form of government, not merely from motives of expediency, but from deference to the universal concurrence of the Church, founded on inspired authority, even if the form of Episcopacy were indifferent, it would be highly presumptuous and disrespectful to separate from the Church on account of it; but if Episcopacy was, as we believe, of apostolic institution, and essential to the constitution of the Church, what before was a matter of insubordination, is now a clear case of desertion or mutiny."

Here we have the arguments of Episcopacy simply, though very forcibly stated. Our author's opinions upon *National Education* are as sound, with the exception of the *primitive custom* of handing over to the Bishop any sum which a churchman may have saved for charitable purposes. Mr. Gresley, hear us! *It does not follow, because a custom is primitive, that it is correct;* the Fathers, like ourselves, were liable to err. With respect to the immediate case before us; why, we ask, should the savings of the churchman be given to the Bishop for distribution? Truly, the churchman, under his own eye, has individual objects deserving of his charity. We do not object, if the churchman is ignorant of deserving objects, to his transferring his pittance to his Diocesan, but we do object to his doing so upon no other principle than because it is a *primitive custom*. The following is the quotation we are desirous of introducing to the notice of our readers:—

"It ought to be impressed strongly on churchmen, that *the maintenance of Church principles is the business of all*. If Church principles are true principles, it is our duty, as Christians, to do all in our power to maintain and to spread them; and if they are, as I verily believe, the principles through which our nation has hitherto prospered, we are still farther bound, as patriots, to uphold their influence. We must act vigorously together, and learn to make sacrifices both of our ease and of our wealth for the cause of truth. Every churchman ought to be solemnly exhorted by God's ministers to set apart a portion of his income for the honour of God, as his forefathers used to do; and the sum so set apart might be entrusted to the Bishop, after the primitive custom, to be by him employed according to his discretion; or, perhaps, more properly, in accordance with modern notions, the Bishop might call in the aid of a council or committee of the principal churchmen in his diocese, or else it might be contributed to those charitable

institutions, of the objects of which the donor most approves. And next to the endowment of churches, *I know no scheme of more immediate urgency, nor any on which the character and fortunes of our country more depend, than education on Church principles.*

While we are making quotations from the work before us, we cannot omit making one from the chapter entitled "The Vestry Meeting." Much, during the last two years, has been written upon church-rates, but no arguments have been so forcible, and at the same time so simple, as those used by Mr. Owen. The scene is full of interest; the result, as might be expected, the most favourable:—

"Most unusual was the scene which the hitherto peaceful village of Welbourne presented on the morning of the meeting. The farmers were seen coming in from all parts, on foot or on horseback; and, though it was a busy time, they one and all declared, with honest English feeling, that they would lose the whole day sooner than not support the Church. The village doctor had already visited his patients, the shopkeeper left his business in the care of his wife; even the squire put off his shooting party, that he might not be absent. All felt that the support of the Church was a more important business than profit or pleasure.

"The village clock had struck the hour of twelve, and the friends of the Church, already assembled, were rather surprised that their opponents had not made their appearance, and began to think that they had given up their intention of opposing the rate. However, their hopes were soon dispelled when they heard the loud shouting, and saw the malcontents walking in a body three and three abreast, straight up the middle of the village, followed by a crowd of boys from the factory and carrying a flag borrowed from an adjoining borough, bearing inscribed on it in large letters, *Civil and Religious Liberty.*

"The Radicals came up at a brisk pace, but were evidently somewhat disconcerted at the respectability, and still more at the numbers of the opposite party. They expected that they should have had to contend with little more than the usual number of attendants at the vestry-meetings, and that they should carry their point with a *coup de main.* It never occurred to these liberal-minded individuals that a whole parish would meet together to vote that they might be taxed.

"It was out of the question that so large a body, or a tenth part of it, should get into the vestry; so there was no alternative but to make use of the body of the church, much to Herbert's regret, who grieved to see the holy place made the scene of ungodly contention.

"Unwilling to set an example of speechifying, Herbert opened the proceedings by simply reading the notice which had called them together, and requesting the churchwardens to give in their estimates, and state the amount of rate which it would be requisite to levy.

"The churchwardens accordingly read to the meeting the calculated expenses for the current year, and briefly added that it had been made out with all possible regard to economy. If any gentleman pro-

sent suspected there was any jobbing or illegal charge, he should be happy to give an explanation. It was true that in former years, when the parish was unanimous, certain charges had been inserted in the church-rates, by common consent, which were not strictly legal,—such as for the moles, hedgehogs,* and organist. In justice to the manufacturing interest, the former charges would in future be defrayed by the farmers solely, and the latter by the congregation who occupied seats in the church. The estimate which he now had the honour of presenting to the vestry was confined strictly to the necessary repairs of the fabric and the decent maintenance of public worship.

“This speech, of course, gave little satisfaction to the malcontents. A call was made for Mr. Stubbs. This gentleman was the principal shopkeeper who supplied the Ashdale population with the necessities and luxuries of life—as bread, butter, cheese, tea, tobacco, and snuff; and having, unfortunately for himself, a gift of talking, he was put forward as the spokesman on the occasion. One cause also of his selection for this honour was, that he professed to be a member of the Church, and on the score of lounging into his pew about once a month, when the service was half over, considered himself an excellent churchman.

“I cannot but here remark of how little use it is for clergymen to go out of their way to conciliate these mongrel sort of people; at least, I mean, by any departure from the straight line of duty. They are sure to desert the Church at the hour of peril, and their desertion is then more mischievous than it would have been had they never professed themselves its members.

“Well, up stands Mr. Stubbs on the seat of one of the pews, and vows he is strongly attached to the Church—none can be more so. He only wished that the Church would see her own interests. For himself, though a churchman, he scorned to put his hands into the pockets of the conscientious Dissenters. All men ought to pay for their own religion. He would rather pay twice the amount of rate, provided it was by voluntary subscription—he would upon his word. It was not that he had any fault to find with the estimate of the churchwardens, but it was the principle of the thing which he objected to. He, for one, would never consent to call on Dissenters to wash the parson's dirty linen. (Loud applause followed this piece of wit, for it is a standing joke amongst the opponents of the church-rates to apply this phrase to the parish surplice.) When the applause subsided, Mr. Stubbs, having no further arguments to offer, concluded by moving that the meeting be adjourned to that day six months.

“Great was the shouting and thumping which followed the conclusion of Mr. Stubbs's oration; and he sat down with the air of a man who had surpassed even himself. There was some little pause—and at last it was announced that Mr. Owen would be glad to address the

* In country parishes it is, or rather was, not uncommon to find such items in the church-rates, as *mole-catcher's salary*; *aid for hedgehogs*.

meeting. 'Mr Owen,' said Herbert to himself, 'who is Mr. Owen?' He looked up and saw, to his surprise, the shrewd and good-tempered face of his talkative fellow-traveller. The cause of Mr. Owen being there was simply this: that, about a year before, he had purchased one of the factories in Ashdale. The business had hitherto been conducted by a foreman, he himself having been detained elsewhere; and he had just arrived to superintend his works in person. Herbert was rather curious to know what his Dissenting friend would say; but expected, like the rest, that he had risen to second Mr. Stubb's motion. It being the first time of Mr. Owen's appearance before the Walbourne public, great attention was paid to his speech.

"*Gentlemen,*" said Mr. Owen, "this [is the first time that I have had the honour of appearing within these walls, and it may naturally be expected, that, having purchased a considerable property in the parish, and having now come to reside in your neighbourhood, I should avail myself of the opportunity to state what are my sentiments on this occasion. Gentlemen, I am a Dissenter from the Church of England; (Hear, hear! from Mr. Stubbs and the Radicals) I have been born and bred a Dissenter, and still remain so. The laws of the country allow a perfect freedom to every one to hold his own religious opinions, provided he does not interfere with those of his neighbour. I have come here, Gentlemen, because I understood there was to be an opposition to a grant of church-rate. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) Perhaps I shall surprise some of you who are present, but I here declare plainly that, *as an honest man, I cannot vote against the church-rate.* (Loud murmurs, and exclamations of surprise from the Radicals, and triumphant shouts from the Church party). I have given the matter a good deal of consideration, especially during the last few days, (here the speaker looked at Mr. Herbert) and if you will favour me with your attention, gentlemen, I will briefly give you my reasons:—

"*'When I purchased my property in Ashdale, I calculated all the outgoings and expenses; I reckoned up the taxes, poor-rates, tithes, church-rates; and, allowing for all these drawbacks, I paid accordingly; I gave so much less for my purchase than I should have done had there been no drawbacks.* Therefore I say, gentlemen, that having bought my property subject to a certain deduction for church-rates, I cannot, as an honest man, turn round and vote against a church-rate, and put the money into my own pocket: it would be a robbery to do so.

"*'Another reason why I cannot vote against the church-rate, is, because I have a respect for the law of the land: and it is the law of the land that a church should be kept up in every parish, by a general assessment on property: and, so long as that law remains unrepealed I am not the man to disobey or evade it.'*"

"*A third reason is, that I consider that by refusing the church-rate I should be robbing the poor, who have a right, by law and long prescription, that a place of worship should be provided for them by the owners of real property, without exception: the property of Dissenters is equally liable with that of others.'*"

"*'And, lastly, I will not vote against the rate, because I do not deem it of sufficient importance to quarrel about. It is but a few shillings,*

after all, and I do not think it is worth disturbing the peace of the parish for such a trifle. My maxim is, "If it be possible, live peaceably with all men." And I have no notion of being dictated to by a set of selfish fellows in London, or any where else, whose purpose it may suit to set us at loggerheads together. I, for one, will not be made their tool; but take the liberty of judging for myself. And I think, gentlemen, if you would do the same, you will see that it will answer no good purpose to carry on this opposition any farther. If you had come to me for advice, I should have said, you had better never have begun it.'

"This speech of Mr. Owen's made a marvellous impression on the assembly. Mr. Owen was owner of the greater part of the cottages in Ashdale—Mr. Stubbs amongst the rest, and his tenants did not much care to vote in opposition to their landlord. Some perceived the force of his argument; the tide of opinion suddenly changed, and many acknowledged that they did not know why they had made all this uproar and confusion."

"The consequence was, that when it came to the show of hands, some had quietly left the Church, others did not vote at all, and the churchmen were in a majority of at least three to one."

"Mr. Herbert briefly addressed the meeting. He was sorry that any difference of opinion should have arisen in the parish; but it was so far satisfactory, that it had proved to him the sincerity of the friends of the Church, and had shown that even its opponents were not indisposed to listen to sound reason. He assured them that nothing should be wanting on his part to promote good neighbourhood so long as he lived amongst them, and he had great hopes that, when the new building at Ashdale was completed, his parishioners on that side could then become aware of the value of the Church."

"And so they separated, better satisfied with each other than when they assembled."

"Herbert's predictions were not disappointed. Ashdale Church was consecrated during the summer, and an active curate established there. Some little jealousy remained for awhile, but by kindness and attention, the population was soon prevailed upon to attend divine worship, and a marked change became apparent in the community. None complained but the owners of the beer and gin shops—not even Mr. Stubbs—for his opinions on religion and politics quickly suited themselves to his customers."

We make no apology for introducing so long a quotation into our pages; we have done so because we, are sure, that should any of our clerical readers have to undergo the same unpleasant meeting as Mr. Herbert, no better argument, no language more forcible or more to the purpose could be used than that by Mr. Owen. Our author, upon this occasion, has done his work bravely. He is an excellent churchman, but he must be cautious, lest, the new party, which is rising within the Church, does not persuade him to forsake his orthodoxy.

The concluding chapters contain an account of our hero in

parliament, his first motion, the debate and division. And the whole is summed up with a conclusion. As a whole, we beg to recommend this work to our readers; but the parts to which we have alluded forbid us giving our unqualified approbation of its contents. We are sorry that we cannot do so. Should another edition of the *Portrait of a Churchman* be called for, we sincerely hope that our author will suppress those parts which express the favourable opinion he has evinced of the *Tracts for the Times* by his becoming fully convinced of their *Papistical Tendency*.

The subject to which our author's attention has been called, is one doubtless of the most interesting, as well as the most important. To draw the character of a *Churchman*, however, requires a hand that is accustomed to paint living characters in the most imposing colours. The subject is the finest that can be offered, and the best adapted to call forth, not the imagination, but those powers of mind that can represent real life; the gentle touch is requisite as a finish to the picture, and that touch ought to be made by the most delicate hand. It is here where our author has failed. Instead of representing the *English Clergyman* of the orthodox school, sterling and sound to the very core, he has impregnated his mind with those fallacious and treacherous dogmas that are propagated by the Oxford Tract party. And thus the *Portrait of the Churchman* does but imperfectly represent that character which we should desire to behold in every professed member of our establishment. If we are to have portraits of Churchmen, let them be free from those heavy touches and blemishes that doth spoil the picture. We must have all the natural, real, characteristic of the original, "All of the olden time," sincere, honest, frank, fearless, and orthodox.

ART. VI.—*The Speeches of Lord Brougham.* Lately published.
The Philological Museum, and Quarterly Journal of Education.
No longer published.

The Critical Works and The Correspondence of Bentley. Not yet published.

[CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 175.]

BY one of those unaccountable whims, which lead men to undertake offices for which they are as unfit as an *Edinburgh Reviewer* is to become the keeper of the King's conscience; not only had Hudson the ambition to be sole editor of *Thucydides*, but Wasse too was desirous to take a part in *Dulce's*

edition of an author that is far beyond the powers of the editors of Sallust and Florus : although, as the compiler of an index, which subsequent scholars have pillaged to shew off their reading, Wasse has done himself some credit and the thieves no little benefit. So high was the character which Wasse once held, that Bentley was led to say of him, that, when he himself should be no more, Wasse would be the most learned man in England. But how deep soever might be the mine of Wasse's erudition, its owner did not possess, like Bentley, an intellectual engine to bring up the ore. We remember scarcely a single passage in the whole of Thucydides, where Wasse has thrown the least light upon an obscurity, however trifling, or corrected an error, however slight. His name occurs occasionally in Kuster's notes on Suidas, but with nothing to justify the encomiums of Bentley ; unless indeed Kuster was indebted to him for the references to the commentators on Aristotle and other out-of-the-way authors quoted in that lexicon. Like his master, Davis, the learned and acute editor of Cicero, but whose notes on Maximus Tyrius are thrown into the shade by those of his friend, Jeremy Markland, Wasse seems to have been more at home in Latin than Greek. His chief delight was, like Caspar Barthius, who edited Claudian when he was only nineteen years old, and who eventually ruined himself by his love of reading, to go into all the nooks and corners and bye-paths of literature, and to grope amongst the middle-age scholiasts on the later Latin writers, in the hope of picking up stray fragments of unknown authors. But with all his delving, the indefatigable Caspar was unable to meet with a single pearl of the least value ; as is evident from a perusal of his folio *Adversaria*, his quarto Claudian, and his three quarto volumes on Statius, the very sight of which would startle a contributor to the *Penny Magazine*, whose extreme limit to an article is a quarter sheet of print. With the view of preserving the results of his researches in the catacombs of scholiasts, Wasse probably commenced his *Bibliotheca Literaria* ; of which, however, only two volumes ever made their appearance. It was superintended by the non-conformist Jebb, whose lady was a hotter partizan for the rights of man, and of woman too, than even her husband ; who is known in the classical world as the editor of Aristides. For the rhetorician of Hadrianopolis Jebb did nothing valuable, except by his collation of MSS. and the publication of some imperfect Scholia, which have been lately given more fully by Frommel and Dindorf from more complete and valuable MSS. than those at Oxford. The *Bibliotheca Literaria* of Wasse was the first of the learned periodicals which have been started at different times in this country, and all with

the same want of success. For neither the *Observationes Miscellaneæ*, planned by Taylor and edited by Jortin, nor within our own memory, the *Classical Journal*, the *Museum Criticum*, or the *Philological Museum*, were able to take root downwards and bear fruit upwards; although they were all supported by some of the principal scholars of the day. Nor is this to be wondered at. For at the very moment when Bentley's nursery-grounds were bursting into flower, there appeared a little canker-worm in the shape of one William Willymott; who deposited in the leaves of a Terence, with English notes, the eggs that were to give birth, eventually, to the reptiles, whose slime was destined to disfigure first, and to destroy afterwards, some beautiful specimen of a *hortus siccus*, collected in Greece and Italy. Of Mr. Willymott's name some of our older readers will probably have a faint recollection, as the author of two works, the terror of tutors unable to purchase a key to the Particles and Peculiars; where the Baconian translator of *Corderius' Colloquies* intended to unfold the art and mystery of writing Latin with peculiar elegance by attending to the particles. Such is our own recollection of these horrid books, that we never look upon even the outside of them without a shudder; and right glad we are, for our children's sake, that they have disappeared for ever, after running out their long lease of 99 years—an immortality nearly the double of what Serjeant Talfourd conceives a Coleridge and a Wordsworth are entitled to. But though the Particles and Peculiars have departed to return no more, yet we doubt not that Willymott's edition of the three plays of Terence will be resuscitated, as being the next worst plan to the now exploded Hamiltonian system; but which, when the Gower-Street Academy was under the wing of Lord Brougham, and the spirit of Locke brooded over the rising school of Materialism, was alone deemed suitable to the intellectual age of the elder children of Time; who are absolutely overpowered by an infinity of garden-pots, all watering the seedling acorns that are to be the future oaks of the country; unless they turn out, what is far more probable, the long, lean, branchless, and heartless pollards of the land.

To return, however, to Bentley. As the sun of Greek criticism was sinking, some stars were seen emerging from its beams and dotting the sky with nearly equal lustre. Amongst these the most conspicuous were Jeremy Markland, John Taylor, and Richard Dawes. The last came the nearest to Bentley; not in the extent of his reading—for Taylor had waded through ten times as much as Dawes in Greek, and Markland nearly as much in Latin—but the second Richard was like the first, conspicuous for that off-handed dash of criticism, so congenial to the

fast men, who feel they can play with a subject; and so offensive to the slow, whose brightest things are lost in the blaze of more brilliant minds. In ridicule or imitation of the boast of Bentley, that he had by him 5,000 emendations on Hesychius, Dawes asserted that he had 1,500 on Aristophanes. Of Bentley's number many are to be found amongst the notes of Kuster, printed by Alberti, and the others in Kuster's papers, that are or were in the Royal Library at Paris: but of Dawes' number none have seen the light, except such as are found in the *Miscellanea Critica*, seven-tenths of which Bentley had already anticipated, unknown to Dawes; as Mr. Burges has shewn, who first published Bentley's MSS. notes on Aristophanes in the *Classical Journal*. When, however, Dawes spoke of his 1,500, he probably alluded to the passages opposed to his syntactical and metrical canons; nearly all of which have been confirmed by the Paris MSS. collated by Brunck, or the Ravenna MS. so fortunately discovered by Invernizzi. When the various readings of the latter were first made known, Porson actually burst into tears, as Alexander did at the conquests of his father; for, said Richard the Third, "that villianous MS. has not only anticipated some of my best emendations, but actually prevented me from making any more, through the fear that another may turn up, as this has done, to prove that criticism founded on induction, is not, as fools fancy, the lucky toss of a die, but a science of the highest order, and superior even to the vaunted mathematics of Senior Wranglers: for in the $x. y.$ study, certain known things are given to find others unknown; but in the $\alpha. \beta.$ pursuit not only is nothing given to find everything, but even incorrect data to elicit correct conclusions. We know, indeed, that Brunck, who adopted the syntactical rules of Dawes, rejected his metrical canons; and we know also, that it is now the fashion in Germany to contest the former. But this arises from the silly vanity of wishing to undo what has been already done, when to go beyond it is impossible. To such an extent has this absurd feeling been carried on the continent, that, in the case of Thucydides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Æschines, Plato, and Aristotle, when MSS. have actually confirmed the rules of composition laid down by the older Atticists and modern Canonists, it has been said that these correct readings are the emendations merely of a learned scribe, who not only knew the laws of the past, but anticipated the discoveries of after-times. Even Valckenaar and Markland have given frequent proofs of their unwillingness to bow to the *dicta* of Dawes. They were too nearly contemporaries to unlearn as men, what they had learnt as children. To this weakness of human nature,

and not to disappointed vanity,* Kidd should have referred the conduct of Markland, who has pointed out what he considered to be mistakes, arising from the rashness of Dawes; for Markland must have felt that Dawes could scarcely have alluded to the *Epistola Critica* and the edition of the *Silvæ of Statius*, unless Dawes went purposely out of his way to mention works, where little is to be found to bear upon the questions mooted in the *Miscellanea Critica*; where Dawes, like Bentley in his Horace, brought together parallel passages to shew not how an ancient author might have written but must have written, to make his language not only intelligible to others, but consistent with himself; nor is it without reason that Bentley closed his celebrated note, where he alters *siccis oculis* into *rectis oculis*, by saying, *aut scripsit id, aut scribere debuit poeta*. It was under similar feelings that Bentley wrote his notes upon Milton, by which he injured less his own reputation than the cause of conjectural criticism. For it has been said that if Bentley could make such mistakes in a language, with which he was, of necessity, more familiar than he could be with Greek and Latin, what reliance can be placed upon his judgment, when he asserts that certain expressions found in all the MSS. of an ancient author are at variance with the genius of the language. The answer is obvious, except to those who are ignorant of the manners of the past. Ancient writers wrote with much greater care than the moderns do. Thucydides was occupied thirty years upon a history, and after all left it incomplete. Virgil was so dissatisfied with the *Æneid*, as to request it to be burnt after his death. Horace, too, says he composed his odes *per laborem plurimum*, and required a work to be nine years under the anvil, before he would acknowledge it as the production of any but a mediocre writer. In Milton's time, as shown by the practice of Dryden, people's pens had begun to move with greater rapidity; while now the *penny-a-liner* would think himself nobody, if he could not make up his measure off-hand and pocket his cash for it on delivery!

* So too Baxter was led, in his second edition of Horace, to decry Bentley's alterations, from finding himself not so much as mentioned in Bentley's notes: and in more recent times Wakefield hurled a *telum imbelles sine ictu* in his *Diatriba Extemporalis*, against Porson's *Hecuba*, because he was treated by Richard the third as Baxter had been by Richard the first. And yet neither of the neglected scholars had any just ground of complaint; for Baxter never attempted emendations, which Bentley was in search of; while Wakefield attempted many, which Porson did not want, and knew to be as incorrect, as their author fancied them to be incontrovertible."

Of the value set by Porson on the discoveries of Dawes, every page of Kidd's edition of the *Miscellanea Critica* is the witness. For Porson saw that Dawes, by carrying out the principles laid down by Bentley, had partially accomplished what he himself was destined to complete by following out the principles of both, in whatever is connected with the extra-choral measures of the Attic stage; while the subsequent discoveries of Hermann and others have brought matters to such a pass, that scarcely a single chorus can be found in tragedy or comedy, of which the law of versification is not accurately known.

Both Markland and Taylor are placed by Burney in his list of "Magnanimous Heroes;" but neither of them were critics of the highest order; although to both Greek literature owes no little obligation—the former for the attention he paid to poetry, and the latter to prose. Even now the *Supplices* of Markland will bear comparison with any edition of a Greek play on the score of learning and ingenuity combined. It wants, indeed, the fullness of reading to be found in Valckenaer's *Phoenissæ*, and *Hippolytus*; but it is superior in the detection of incongruities in sentiment and the neatness of the emendations. But the peculiar feature in all Markland's writings is the gentlemanly tone that pervades them: praise is everywhere bestowed in forcible language, censure in mild; even Pauw is merely designated as *sacrilegus, qui manibus heroum insultaverat*. Of his powers, as a conjectural critic, the most continued proofs were given in his "Epistola Critica," from which the prince of plagiarists, Valart, pilfered unblushingly the choicest emendations to grace his edition of Horace. For this detection of the French rogue we are indebted to Kidd, in the "Classical Journal," No. 33, p. 12, who has there perpetuated also, from a copy now in the British Museum, Bentley's opinions of Markland's alterations; scarcely one of which seems to have met with his approbation. This, however, is not to be wondered at. "No critic," said Elmsley, "ever considers any corrections but his own to be even passable, much less the very words of the author." As an editor, Markland's own works are few; but he was very communicative to others, especially to Davis, whose quarto edition of *Maximus Tyrius* is enriched with a continued series of his annotations. So too the *Lysias* of Taylor receives no little lustre from the short but valuable remarks of his learned friend; who, from the fact of his touching so often upon the New Testament, was considered by Reiske to be an English divine, what Taylor was in reality, but not till late in life, having taken his degrees originally in Civil Law. It is to this

latter circumstance we are probably to attribute the attention he paid to Greek prose. For as he was, doubtless, anxious to ascertain what connexion existed between the laws of Rome and Athens, it was necessary to make himself master of the Greek orators, the channel through which nearly all our knowledge of the laws of Athens is derived. But whatever may have been the motives that led Taylor to the courts and hustings of Athens, it is creditable to his taste as a good scholar, though not to his tact as a money-saving economist, to have been the first to give an impulse to the study of Greek oratory at a time, when England was witnessing, in the person of the first Pitt, an orator and statesman united, such as Athens saw in her Pericles, and Philip would have found in Demosthenes, had not the mob-leaders of that day, like the Whigs of our own, taught the people that patriotism is, what Brutus said of virtue and Falstaff of valour, a word; that the best of things is *gold*, and the only deity to be worshipped *self*.

From the time of Hieronymus Wolfius to that of Taylor, no attention had been paid to the remains of Demosthenes and Æschines, except in the Prælectiones of Downes in England, and Lucchesini's translation in Italy: while, for the minor orators, nothing had been done since the time of Henry Stephens—a period of more than a century and half. It was, therefore, a noble design, and as difficult as noble, to direct the current of reading to those simple yet powerful remains of forensic eloquence, to the perusal of which Lord Brougham attributes his power to arrest the ears of country louts before York Castle and of ladies fair at Exeter Hall; to still the hubbub in the House of Commons, and to stir even the gravity of the House of Lords. So little, however, was the nation then alive to the beauties of his Lordship's models in oratory, that in the very county, where an University has lately sprung up, when the head master of Newcastle school sent his subscription for Taylor's intended edition of Demosthenes, Dawes told him it was the only one he could get from the land of coals; while such is the degraded state of English scholarship at present, that we doubt if more than a single schoolmaster could be found to accompany his subscription, as Dawes did, with a learned dissertation by way of postscript.

But though Taylor's Demosthenes remained, like Sydenham's translation of Plato, unfinished for the want of public patronage, yet in the two volumes of his imperfect Demosthenes and Æschines, and his complete Lysias, he bequeathed to posterity a legacy which was soon converted to good purpose by

Reiske; who, assisted by his blue-stocking lady, gave about thirty years afterwards his marvellous edition of the Greek orators. Whatever may have been Reiske's deficiency as a critic in Greek verse, in Greek prose he has never seen his equal; and though Krueger has sneered at the stream of emendations which Reiske poured out in his Dionysius, yet the clever translator of Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, must despair of contending with his countryman for the eye to see and the hand to remove a blemish. We knew, of course, that both Ruhnken and Wyttenbach thought and spoke lightly of Reiske's *improptu* corrections; but neither of them lived to see the confirmation given to them by the subsequent discoveries of MSS.; and it is with no little delight we witness the tardy justice done to that indefatigable editor by the scholars of the present day. Such has been the value set upon Reiske's edition of the orators, that it has been twice reprinted, once in Germany, with the addition of Schoefer's notes, and again in England by the late Mr. Dobson; who not only incorporated the notes of different editors and Bekker's collations of MSS., but even recollated himself the Harleian and Burney MSS. in the British Museum. Such too has been the fever of fashion in this once neglected field of literature, that every Leipzig fair sees some unfortunate orator of Athens groaning under the weight of a "Commentarius perpetuus" on every line of the original. In England, however, the only impetus given by Taylor was seen in the publication of Isocrates by Battie; who having nothing to say, wisely said nothing; and in this respect was wiser than the Foulkes and Friends, the Stocks and the Mounteneys; all of whom edited some small portion of Demosthenes, and had the hardihood to print what was either useless or wrong.

In the same year that Taylor's Lysias appeared, Upton gave his edition of Epictetus, in a manner not discreditable to himself, yet not with that high tone of scholarship that an editor should exhibit who feels a perfect familiarity with his subject. A similar remark is applicable to Bryan, the editor of *Plutarch's Lives*, who was first known to the learned world by the praise of Hare, in the preface to his *Terence*. It must be confessed, however, that Bryan, like Taylor, had not an easy task to perform in venturing upon an author, for whom nothing had been done since the time of Xylander, and whose very bulk carries with it a "*noli me tangere*;" to say nothing of the difficulties of the style and the corruptions of the text. The latter, it is true, have been diminished by the collations of MSS., but enough is still left to exercise and even baffle the sagacity of first-rate

scholars; and hence little could be expected from such men as Barton and Pemberton, who gave editions of some separate treatises of Plutarch.

Of the other works that appeared a little before or after the death of Bentley, only four require particular notice. The first is the *Callimachus* by T. Bentley, a nephew of the great Richard, to whom Dawes unaccountably attributes it; although the mere inspection of the coin was enough to show it could not have come from the mint of the master of the Trinity. The second is the *Longinus* by Pearce, Bishop of Rochester; who, like Davis, was more at home in Latin than Greek, as shown by his edition of *Cicero de Oratore*. The third is Squire's edition of Plutarch's treatise *Περὶ ἰσίδος*, valuable, not so much for the notes of the Bishop of St. David's, as for those of Markland; who, we suspect, enriched a reprint of Johnson's *Sophocles* that appeared in 1746 with a few neat emendations, very similar to those he sent to Burton for his *Pentalegia*, and to Musgrave for his *Hippolytus*, the *avant courier* of the Oxford physician's edition of the *Philosophic Dramatist of Athens*.*

The fourth is the *Homer* of Clarke; whose former celebrity demands a longer notice.

Of the intellectual affinity by which minds are brought together to one point, as bodies are by the affinities of matter, ample proof is given by the fact that the two most profound and acute metaphysicians of England were so passionately fond of Homer, as to be led, the one to translate and the other to edit him. To climb up the steep of Parnassus, in fact or in fancy, is no easy task; nor had Hobbes a right to complain, if they, who deemed his version of Thucydides inimitable, still feel that poetry and prose are at the very antipodes of the sphere of literature, and regret his appearance in a character so little suited to him. Nor, in the case of Clarke, was his translation of Newton's *Principles* into Latin, the best preparation for an editor of Homer. We know indeed that Clarke's object was not so much to explain the ideas of his author, as to broach certain fancies of his own, touching the metaphysics of the Greek tenses and the laws of poetical licence; to overthrow the *dicta* of grammarians about the dual number, and to sup-

* After Musgrave's death appeared his notes on the *Bee of Colonus*. They contain very little for the solution of the difficulties of Sophocles. Unless the Doctor hoped to cure his patients more successfully than he did the diseased passages in the Tragedians, he would have done better in not setting up for a physician.

port the doctrine of Pope, that "the sound should be an echo to the sense." And yet, strange to say, the edition published by a person so little competent by his routine of study to compete with even a Scholefield, had the singular good fortune not only to eclipse its predecessors, but to become the standard of such authority, as to be reprinted by Ernesti; nor was it laid on the shelf until all the old ideas upon the question of the Homeric language and versification were displaced by the new, especially as regards the digamma, whose appearance, says Kidd, has ousted a swarm of particles it would puzzle a score of Hoo-geveens to explain.

Not content, however, with the transformation of a philosopher into a philologist, Clarke must needs act the part of a critical condor, whose business it is ever to scent out and fasten upon a putrid carcase. But whatever might have been his wish to imitate a beak of the Bentley brood, he wanted the power to take the lofty, or preserve the continued flight of the monarch bird. Some half dozen emendations on Homer, and three or four on Sophocles and Euripides form the whole amount of his offences in guessing; still it is pleasant to find a mathematician, who had imbibed a taste for the melody of a Greek verse, and who had acuteness enough to see that an old Latin version of a speech in Sophocles contained a clue to the original Greek. At the present day, Clarke's *Homer* is remarkable only for being the work where the existence of the Harleian MS. of the *Odyssey* was first made known; but whose various readings were given so imperfectly by T. Bentley, that had not Porson examined it thoroughly, we should have known nothing of its real value, nor have felt how great are the obligations which the lovers of Homer are under to the Grenville family, for giving us the result of Porson's scholarlike collation; despite the abuse of Payne Knight, who stated in the *Edinburgh Review*, V. XIV, p. 431., that the editors of the Grenville Homer were at least a century behind the rest of the world in critical knowledge; as if the old Homer of Porson will not be read, when the new one of Knight shall be clean forgotten.

Although it does not fall in with our plan to notice the editors of authors not strictly classical, yet we cannot omit the editor of the more than half classical Philo; who, with his countryman, Josephus, has shown that a Jew could write Greek as pure as a Polybius from the south, and a Plutarch from the north of Greece itself; for the two foreigners had studied more attentively than the half-Greek, half-Roman writers had done, the best models of Attic prose, Thucydides and Plato. This was a step that

Mangey deemed it needless to take; and hence he excited the wrath of even the placid Rupaken, whose sneers he would have escaped, had he, like Massey, the editor of Plato's Republic, never opened his lips. Not quite so taciturn was Thompson, the editor of the Parmenides of Plato, who was a better metaphysician than critic, and to whom we are indebted for some previously unpublished fragments of Damascius *Περὶ Ἀεχῶν*. On the other hand, Forster, who edited three dialogues of Plato, and to whom we owe some extracts from a MS. Commentary of Olympiodorus on the Phædo, was a better critic than metaphysician; while Etwall, the editor of the Alcibiades, was neither the one nor the other; and the same may be said of the twin editors of Aristotle, Wilkinson and Winstanly; and equally incompetent for the task he undertook was Holwell, the editor of extracts from Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

To the foregoing list of Oxford Editors must be added Chandler, better known by his travels; who gave some Greek lyric fragments and epigrams, with notes from Ursinus, whose edition he took for the basis of his own, which is one of the few books printed at Oxford without accents, and with a title page entirely Greek. It is seldom to be met with; even the British Museum has not a copy. It contains just two corrections by Chandler, one is of a line of Bacchylides, where he would read *γλυκείων* for *γλυκεία*, and the other is the alteration of *ἐκατομπόδων* into *ἀκατομπόδων* in Soph. Œd. C. 718; and though both are manifestly incorrect, they are not more so than the mass of those recorded by Elmsley, in his edition of the *Œdipus Coloneus*; a play that has come down to us in a state as corrupt as the *Supplices* of Æschylus, and the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, and has therefore baffled the united labours of Rusig, Elmsley and Hermann—“*cum multis aliis, quos nunc perscribere longum est.*” It has, however, been oftener than once selected for College lectures at Cambridge, we presume, for the purpose of showing off the talents of the tutors in making darkness visible.

“’Tis true ’tis pity, and pity ’tis ’tis true,” that on the banks of the Isis, where Oxford can point to the richest libraries, there have been found the poorest of scholars; while the Cam, whose stream reflects the meanest of libraries, has seen the greatest of critics. During more than two centuries and a half the old university can boast of only two first-rate scholars, Toup and Tyrwhitt, and one second-rate, Musgrave; the others, such as Warton, the editor of *Theocritus*, and the late Bishop Burgess, the re-editor of *Dawes’ Miscellanea Critica* and of *Burton’s Pentalogia*—two works the very antipodes to each other—were

of no mark in criticism, although each in his own peculiar line gained for himself a fair report; while West, the editor of *Pindar*, Simpson and Wells of *Xenophon* and *Dionysius Periegetes*, and Shaw of *Apollonius Rhodius*, are known to us only by their names in the title-pages. Even Hutchinson, whose edition of the *Cyropedia* and *Anabasis* were once standard works, is remarkable now but as the pilferer, so Valckenaer asserted, of the notes of Perizonius on *Ælian*; a fact of course unknown to Robinson, the editor of *Hesiod*, by whom Hutchinson was called upon to complete his edition of *Xenophon*, begun so auspiciously, and to which none but an equally able hand could put the finishing stroke. Of Robinson's own notes it may be said, that they are too learned for those who do not know the original author, and not critical enough for those who do. Hutchinson might, however, have retorted the charge of plagiarism upon Perizonius himself; who has brought forward arguments very similar to those produced by Bentley, when exposing the mistakes of the retailer of anecdotes; who in *Var. Hist.* iii. 8. had confounded one Phrynichus with another; and as the *Ælian* of Perizonius did not appear till a year and a half after the publication of Bentley's *Dissertation on Phalaris*, it seems strange he should have agreed so closely with Bentley without having seen that work.

With regard to the Oxford scholars of more recent times, Falconer, the editor of *Strabo*, is best known by the abuse of Payne Knight, in the *Edinburgh Review*, and by the present Bishop of Landaff's defence of him in the *Classical Journal*; while Benwell, the editor of *Xenophon's Memorabilia*, still lives in the recollection of his early death; for to him, as to many others occupied in the words and thoughts of the past, consumption came in the garb of glory, and proffered the fatal chalice crowned with what seemed to be a wreath of amaranth.

It must be confessed, however, that Cambridge can equal her sister University in the bathos of editorial unfitness in the persons of Goulstone and Cooke, the brother editors of the *Poetics of Aristotle*. In Cooke's edition, especially, we find how little is requisite to make up a passable Greek Professor at Cambridge, and the mediocre translator of beautiful English into non-descript Greek. The puerility of the Professor's notes is equalled only by the errors in the translation of *Gray's Elegy*, in which, said Porson, there are as many faults as lines; to say nothing of the absurdity of doing what cannot be correct, unless it be a cento, and which, if it be a cento, is nothing worth.

Cooke was, however, not the only seventh-form boy alluded

to in "*The Pursuits of Literature*," who, after amusing himself with such translations, afterwards becomes an editor of a Greek work. Stephen Weston put forth the fragment of *Hermesianax*, reviewed by Porson in the *Monthly Review*, and a little brochure under the title of ; "*Horatius cum Scriptoribus Græcis collatus*" --a copy of which, interleaved and with considerable additions, was, if we mistake not, sold at the sale of Weston's library, and purchased probably by Heber; but where the volume is at present we know not.

This by the way; and we now return to Toup and Tyrwhitt, the twin heroes of Oxford scholarship.

To the merits of that illustrious couple, two equally illustrious scholars of Holland have borne a testimony, which no men of the present day are fit either to give or to receive. Of Toup Valckenaer said, when he saw the emendations on Suidas, that Jonathan was born for the advancement of Greek literature; while of Tyrwhitt Ruhnken has spoken in the "*Bibliotheca Critica*" in terms so beautiful, as regards both the sentiment and language, that we will not mar their effect by a translation, but will rather refer the reader to the original. Porson, too, who never paid attention to inferior critics, thought it worth his while to write some short notes upon Toup's *Suidas*, with the view of shewing that Jonathan was not quite so clever as he fancied himself, nor so honest as he should have been. On the latter point, Porson has hardly made good his assertion. Toup was too rich to steal. Wherever he coincides with others, it was rather the result of accident than design. In the consciousness of mental superiority, and the felicity of his emendations, Toup stands next to Bentley and Dawes; and though he is far superior to the latter in the extent of his erudition, he vastly inferior in his acquaintance with the niceties of language and metre. Except of the ordinary kinds of verse, he knew nothing, disgusted, probably, with Heath's childish application of the *dicta* of Hephæstion to the lyric measures of the Greek drama. The head-master of Eton would indeed have made a capital conductor of an orchestra, and yet want the power to produce, *à la Paganini*, a full-toned note from a Greek lyre with all the aid of the best of quills. Of Toup's deficiency of ear some curious proofs are given by Porson; who with Bentley in a greater, and Valckenaer in a less degree, was frequently enabled to detect a fragment of poetry concealed in prose, just as Dr. Maginn has the rhymes of Mr. D'Israeli, jun. in his unapparent verse. Besides his *Emendations on Suidas* and *Notes on Theocritus*, Toup published an edition of *Longinus*, with the notes of Ruhnken

prefixed to his own, which he kept so long by him, as to lead Ruhnken to believe they would never be published. But Toup delayed his edition only till he had collected materials to prove that his own were not unworthy to be placed in the same volume with those of Ruhnken, which, after all, he would have failed to do, had Ruhnken been enabled to employ the interval between sending his notes and their publication, in adding to their number and value; for so did Toup himself, in the case of his own notes, communicated to Warton for his *Theocritus*; where the "*Addenda*" and "*Curæ Posteriores*," more than equal the matter sent originally. Tyrwhitt, too, like Porson, marked some of the passages where Toup had failed, and suggested alterations that exhibit a finer tact of criticism; for he possessed in perfection, what Toup wanted the power to produce the greatest effect with the least effort; witness his *Emendations on Euripides*, that form the chief ornament of Musgrave's edition, and those on *Aristophanes*, communicated to Brunck, who had the folly and dishonesty united to pass them off as his own, little dreaming that Tyrwhitt had kept a copy of them, and still less that the originals would appear after the death of both, and thus verify the language of the poet:—

Ἀναφαίνεται δ' ὁ θνήσκων
Ὀλολύξεται δ' ὁ κλέπτων.

Witness, too, his conjectures on *Strabo*; those on the Pseudo-Orphic poem on precious stones; those on the Pseudo-Babrian fables, and the half dozen on the oration of Isæus, and the fragment of Plutarch, both first published by him from the Milan and Harleian MSS. respectively; while they, who are anxious to see with what facility a first-rate Greek scholar can become a first-rate English critic, must turn from Tyrwhitt's edition of the *Poetics of Aristotle* to his edition of *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*; the notes of which will teach the advocates for the exclusive study of the Teutonic tongues, that no little advantage is to be obtained from an accurate acquaintance with the languages of Greece and Rome. Even the late Francis Douce was stopped, we know, in his researches upon the *Æsopic Fables*, in which he had been deeply engaged, in consequence of his ignorance of Greek.

A little prior to the time of Tyrwhitt appeared King, the editor of three plays of Euripides, and who, like Heath, had thumbed his Hephæstion very diligently. His edition was reprinted by Morell, head-master of Eton, better known as the editor and English translator of the *Prometheus of Æschylus*, but best of all as the compiler of the "*Thesaurus Poeticus*,"

subsequently re-edited and improved by the present Bishop of Durham, the pupil of Parr and the friend of Porson, from both of whom Dr. Maltby received some valuable communications. So too, Northmore, a friend of Wakefield, edited *Tryphiodorus* in an elegant, rather than a critical manner; while his predecessor, Merrick, not only edited, but, like Morell, translated into English his author, and so did Bentham; who gave an edition of the *Funeral Orations of Thucydides, Plato, and Lysias*, accompanied with notes that, in the case of Thucydides, plainly prove how little competent he was to grapple with the difficulties and corruptions of the Heraclitus of history.

Thus then have we arrived at the last of Burney's "magnanimous heroes," and the third Richard in the list of the monarchs of English scholarship. Of Porson, who united in his own person the learning of Bentley, the acuteness of Dawes, and the tact of Tyrwhitt, what can we say that has not been said already? and as we cannot be original, we will not be the echo merely of others. Despite, however, his resemblance to Bentley,* not only in the powers of his mind, but in the use of his weapons—for both could wield a sledge-hammer or a bodkin, to give his opponent a *quietus*—in one point the reigns of the two Richards differed most woefully. It was the happy fate of Bentley to be the morning-star of English scholarship; it was Porson's less fortunate destiny to herald its decay. The former was the Buonaparte [dashing on to conquest with a *cortège* of young aspirants to renown; the latter was the Moreau, leading a retreat with only the counterpart of Falstaff's ragged regiment. When Bentley disappeared, although his mantle fell upon no single prophet, yet portions of it were caught by many hands. When Porson died, like the Phoenix in its nest, no young bird was seen to burst into life from the ashes of its parent. Had Dobree not been snatched away so early, and had he enjoyed the robust health of a Boys, he would in due time have exhibited the ripe and rich fruits of reading, not so extensive as accurate, of which we find only the germs in his *Adversaria*, and little more than the half-set blossoms in the addenda to Porson's Remains. We know, indeed, that Parr used to sneer at the *Porsunculi*, who, after Porson's death, aped, he said, 'twas all they could do, the cut of Cato's beard. But the parties alluded to, now on the bishops' bench, and who, like Archbishop Potter, have either

* Hermann, however, says that "Porson wanted the genius and originality of Bentley, and shewed nothing of that freedom of intellect which finds out with ease the shortest process by which a complexity of combined materials is reduced into its primitive elements."

forgotten, or are indifferent to classical literature, were of Porson's faith only as opposed to the heresies of Hermann; whom Parr, from his usual sympathy in behalf of *floggee*, took under his wing, when he found that the crow, who had been cawing at the eagle, had been struck by the monarch-bird, and was lying in the convulsive agonies of death. The storm, however, that raged so furiously during Porson's life, was hushed at his decease, when the two streams of English and German criticism united, and reflected only the unclouded heaven of editorial friendship. Elmsley, who had decried Hermann's first work on metre as the very worst book of its kind, was hailed by Hermann as the still living Porson; and in Hermann Elmsley saw the resuscitation of a Bentley. Did, however, Elmsley's ghost still flit about St. Alban's Hall, how would the *δολερὸν ὄμμα* of the late Oxford head, appear like the *χλοερὸν ὄμμα* of the defunct cow-keeper of Lerna, to hear Hermann confessing that Elmsley's emendations on Aristophanes and Athenæus coincide too often with those of Porson. Does, then, Sir Godfrey insinuate that Elmsley was a plagiarist on the Professor. And yet, if the truth must be told, such are his suspicions; which will cease to be surmises merely, when he hears the following narrative of facts.

Elmsley's first appearance as a classical scholar was, "*credite posteri*," in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*; where he wrote the article on Heyne's *Homer*, Wyttenbach's *Plutarch*, and Schweighæuser's *Athenæus*. In the last paper appeared some beautiful emendations of passages that had defied the sagacity of previous scholars. When Porson saw them, he recognised them as his own; but was at a loss to know how the reviewer got at them, until he was reminded that he had met Elmsley at a dinner party, and that in the course of the evening he had poured out his emendations on Athenæus, as freely as he emptied the bottles, beginning with brandy and ending with small beer. After that time he never would open his lips in the presence of Elmsley; for, said he, even walls have ears. The story was known to all Porson's friends; hence, at his death, when his books, with MSS. notes, were placed under the care of Mackinlay, the bookseller, previous to their being sent to Trinity College, by whom they had been purchased for one thousand pounds, strict orders were given for not a soul to see them. But as Elmsley's uncle had been Mackinlay's partner, Peter, who had the run of the house, contrived to evade the injunction, and to get access to the golden, but ill-guarded, treasure, and employed the whole of a Sunday, and the greater part of the pre-

ceding Saturday, in transcribing what was likely to be useful to him as the future editor of Aristophanes; and as he knew that even if Porson's *Adversaria* were published at all, some time would elapse before they made their appearance, he anticipated that the very coincidence, of which Hermann complains, would be the best proof of his being a Porson *redivivus*. Unfortunately, however, for the success of Elmsley's well laid scheme of editorial renown, Porson had communicated to his friends some of the very emendations, a which Elmsley had passed off as his own in his *Acharnenses*. Upon this second proof of wondrous agreement between the two Grecians, some inquiries were made into the circumstances; when it was discovered that Mackinlay's cook had let Elmsley in on the Saturday, and had got his dinner for him on the Sunday, while he was filling his pockets with the forbidden fruit. So conscious indeed was Elmsley of his having acted the part of the *furtiva cornicula*, that he endeavoured to suppress his edition of the *Acharnenses*; but just as the copies were out of the market he found, to his horror, that the work had been reprinted at Leipzig. How much of Elmsley's notes are really his own it is difficult to ascertain. We shrewdly suspect that the germs of all his metrical and syntactical niceties, especially in what relates to the utility of remarking what particles are united together in Greek, were obtained from hints thrown out by Porson. His best things are his articles on Porson's *Preface*, and Blomfield's *Prometheus* in the *Edinburgh Review*; those on Markland's three plays in the *Quarterly*; those on Hermann's *Supplices*, and *Hercules Furens* in the *Classical Journal*, and on the *Ajax* in the *Museum Criticum*. In his editions of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, and *Coloneus*, *Heraclidæ*, *Bacchæ* and *Medea*, he was less acute, and more to the taste of tutors and their pupils, from his constant reference to Matthiæ's *Greek Grammar*, a work that one of the Valckenaer school would have quoted only to correct. Busily employed in picking up some curious shells on the shore of the wide sea of criticism, Elmsley seldom raised his eyes to view the mighty expanse of troubled waters, nor when he saw some crazy craft labouring in a storm, had he the courage to put himself into a life-boat and bring away a portion of the valuable cargo. Still less was he gifted with the power of restoring a faded picture of antiquity; while he was utterly incompetent to exhibit the highest proof of critical acumen, by forming *à la Cuvier*, a perfect skeleton out of the scattered portions of half-destroyed fossil remains. In his latest works, he howed, what Gibbon said of Warburton, that he was *épuisé*.

Elmsley was, however, not the only scholar who got fat on

the picking of Porson's brains. We have heard from a friend of the Professor's, and one who knew him from his entrance at Eton to his exit from life, that the substance of all the articles written by Burney for the *Monthly Review* was furnished by Porson. Long before we heard this anecdote, we had guessed as much by comparing some of Porson's canons with those promulgated by Burney in his articles upon the late Bishop Huntingford's *Greek Monostrophics*, and the Apology for them; upon the clever but ill-fated Glasse's Greek translations of Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, and Mason's *Caractacus*; upon the present Bishop of Lichfield's *Prize Poems*; on the surreptitious Glasgow *Æschylus*, and Wakefield's *Diatribæ Extemporalis*. We believe that the whole of the metrical canons respecting the construction of the Alcaic stanza, according to its most perfect form, was the discovery of Porson alone. About the time the rules appeared in print, they were taught by Dr. Raine at the Charter-house, and Dr. Goodall at Eton, both of whom had been old friends of Porson; but neither of them ever attributed the canons to Burney. We suspect that with a delicate attention to Burney's character as a scholar, and his profit as a schoolmaster, Porson was unwilling to claim his own property; for he felt, no doubt, that some future critic would arise, and by following up the hints silently given in his acknowledged works, for the detection of unacknowledged obligation, verify the saying:—

Χρόνος λαθραία πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἀγει κακά.

In fact, every part of Burney's criticism turns upon those delicate points, so certain to arrest the attention of an admirer of Dawes and Bentley, and which Porson was not only quick to catch, but anxious to sift with the patient industry that leaves no stone unturned, and the flexible ingenuity that confronts error at every corner. It was this rare union of drudgery and genius that enabled Porson to throw out his critical canons apparently unguarded, and when they were attacked by Hermann, not only to silence his artillery, but to destroy the citadel where his antagonist had entrenched himself, and from whence he blazed away with so much noise and so little effect, that he now readily acknowledges the superior talents of Porson on those very questions of metrical science, of which Hermann said that Porson might know the facts, but was ignorant of the theory; as if, truly, our business is to enquire not what a verse is, but why it is so.

It will be urged, perhaps, in defence of Burney, that Porson was too indolent to dictate, much less to write, the long articles alluded to. But we have his own authority for asserting that though he chose to write short notes, he could scribble very long.

ones if requisite. Beloe, too, in his *Sexagenarian*, says the world does not know one half of what Porson put in print. During the time that Beloe was editor of the *British Critic*, articles appeared in that review for which nobody ever dreamed of giving the credit to Porson; such, for instance, was the review of Dr. Kipling's edition of the *Codex Theodori Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. So, too, during the time that the Rev. Mr. Hunt, a cousin of the present Bishop of Gloucester, was the editor of the defunct *Critical Review*, he obtained from Porson the substance of the remarks in the article on Walpole's *Specimens of Scarce Translations*, and especially the criticism on Walpole's Greek versions of Molière and Luis de Leon. Had Burney been really the author of the articles alluded to, most assuredly he would have given in his *Tentamen* some proofs of sagacity similar to those exhibited in the *Monthly Review*. In a work, however, so highly extolled by the present Bishop of London in the *Edinburgh Review*, and by Dobree in the *Classical Journal*, we can find nothing to mark even the metrical scholar, much less the ingenious critic, except the pretty arrangement of the final chorus of the Supplices; which the Germans have disfigured by converting the novel stanzas into the common-place artistrophes. And yet what a fine field for the sagacity of a scholar did the choral corruptions of Æschylus offer to Burney, had he been the eagle-eyed critic which the articles in the *Monthly* prove their author to be. So too in his naked edition of the *Lexicon of Philemon*, would Burney have been content to send that useless volume into the world, had he felt himself equal to the task of treading in the footsteps of the Dutch critics? all of whom, when mere tyros, published Greek lexicons in a way that few veterans could do now. In half the time requisite to get up the shortest of his articles in the *Monthly*, Burney might have done all that was requisite for a lexicon, every particle of which had been already printed in the Etymologicon of Phavorinus, as noticed by Bast; nor need he have recommended it to the joint care of his pupil, the present Bishop of Lincoln, his two friendly reviewers, Bishop Blomfield and Dobree, and in case of their refusing to act, to Bishop Monk, then professor of Greek at Cambridge. But as none of the four felt disposed to take up the deserted foundling, the Rev. R. Walpole, and not the Bishop of London, as Osann the Leipzig editor fancied, very good-naturedly stept forward in the *Museum Criticum*, and gave the little stranger its first baby-cloths; while Mr. Burges, in the *Classical Journal*, put on its first tucker in the shape of an index.

Of Burney's powers we formed a very low estimate indeed,* ever since we heard that, whenever he was asked his opinion upon a passage, he always avoided it by saying that he must previously know what the commentators had determined upon it; as if every passage, whether easy, difficult, or corrupt, did not present *data* enough to lead to some conclusion *instanter*. In fact, Burney of himself could do nothing but scribble in his books a few marginal notes, carefully copied from the works of others. We have turned over a good many of his books in the British Museum, and can testify that scarcely a single valuable, much less original, idea is to be met with from first to last. In the early part of life Burney certainly read Greek, and especially the Dramatists, with great attention. But nature denied him what is granted but to few, the undefinable faculty of genius. He loved Greek more than Greek loved him; and hence all his endeavour to gain the character of a first-rate scholar would have been "Love's labour lost," had he not stuck to Porson; to whom he was, what Bolton had been to Watts, "the monied partner of the man of brains."

Amongst the few contributions to periodicals, which Kidd has reprinted in the *Miscellaneous Criticisms of Porson*, is the review of the edition of a Pseudo-Plutarchean treatise published by a Dr. Edwards; whose father had previously put forth a Theocritus, and did for Greek what Willymott had done for Latin, by commencing the practice, which has now spread too far and wide to be ever eradicated, of writing English notes upon ancient authors, in whom they alone can feel the least interest who have not forgotten their Latin. In the attempt of these lofty-minded men to imitate Socrates, who was said to have brought down philosophy from the clouds, "the leaden sire of a leaden race," conceived, no doubt, he was giving the masses a taste of the tree of knowledge, hitherto confined to the favoured few, and that he was extending information by smoothing the path to it. It is, however, only necessary to peep into the precious productions of the father and son to be convinced that, like the majority of their successors,—amongst whom is pre-eminent another Edwards, so justly cut up by Blomfield in the *Museum Criticum*—they have exhibited their perfect inability to impart the least information;

* In the estimation of Payne Knight, however, Burney was 'vir Ἀττικώτατος nec minus animi virtutibus quam ingenii elegantia æstimabilis,' as stated in his *Prolegomena to Homer*, § 150. On the other hand, Lachmann, who published a most absurd work *De Choric. Systemat.*, describes Burney as 'summum literatæ Britanniae dedecus.'

while their deficiency is only the more apparent by their use of a living tongue in preference to a dead one.

Not that we mean to assert the impossibility of a man exposing himself in print, even when he writes in Latin—witness the mass of German critics, whose adoption of a dead language proves that nonsense is not confined to the living tongues. But the probability is that he, who cannot write Latin fluently, will not write it at all, to the great advantage of literature; for as nine-tenths of what is written is worth nothing, the matter thus kept out of sight would probably have belonged to the worthless portion. We could mention the masters of more schools than one, who have discovered that, if they had concealed their ideas in a Latin garb, fewer of their pupils would have detected the poverty of their teachers' minds.

We come now to the closing scene of English scholarship; where the figure of Peter Paul Dobree stands, as contrasted with Burney and Elmsley, on the pinnacle of honour. With an admiration bordering on worship, not only for the talents of Porson as a scholar, but for his integrity as a man, and for his utter contempt, as a philosopher, of the pelf of the Baconians, Peter Paul, who in his features, gait, and tastes, was the very counterpart of his friend and master, Richard, would have thought it a sacrilege to appropriate to himself even a hint suggested by Porson; in whose defence he first entered the critical arena by his article on Bothe's *Æschylus* in the *Monthly Review*; offended as he was by the young German editor, just fresh from a lecture-room, presuming to speak contemptuously of Porson as *Anglus quidam*: and this too after Porson had given abundant proof in the *Glasgow Æschylus*, so unblushingly pillaged by Schütz, that it was one thing to restore an author with a few certain emendations, and another to mutilate him, Bothe-like, by a mass of absurd alterations, nearly all of which the German has lived to repudiate. In his guesses, as Mr. Donaldson calls them, Dobree did not often snatch a grace beyond the reach of art. He was too fearful of falling to venture upon the slippery steep of conjectural criticism. Like Porson, he preferred taking a place by sapping than by assaulting it. Hermann, who is always just to the dead, however severe he may be on the living, has said that Greek literature has sustained a heavy loss by the death of Dobree. Poppo, on the other hand, decries his emendations on Thucydides as perfectly useless, and equalling Reiske's in rashness; and while Dr. Arnold, of Rugby School, chatters about the ignorance of Dobree, a young sprig of a German editor of Andocides enacts the part of Falstaff in

Shakspeare, and thus slays the twice-killed Peter with all the valour of the big-bellied knight.

“Quum magis oblectandi causa quam ut ingenium acueret, omnes perlegisse Græcorum scriptores videatur Dobræus, factum est, ut multa protulerit et audacter et leviter disputata; quæ tamen vir doctissimus nunquam publici juris facere volebat; certe si voluisset, eorum, quæ scripserat, maximam partem rescuisset.”

That Dobree would have rejected a portion of what Scholefield has published, is probable enough, but not at the suggestion of Schiller; to whom, if he merely gave his cast-off corrections, the German would have, what he now wants, something to cover the nakedness of his scholarship. To Dobree likewise belongs, if we mistake not, the article on Walpole's *Comicorum Græcorum Fragmenta*, in the *Monthly Review*; where the future historians of plagiarism will find something to their purpose; and to which may be added not only Kidd's paper in the *Classical Journal* “On Literary Coincidences,” but a curious article that appeared in a very rare work, *Symbolæ Literariæ ed. Ikenio Bremæ* 1744, where Schlichter has collected some curious tales about the critics who lived on the leavings of the illustrious Scaliger.

Here then ends our history of the rise, progress, and decay of English Scholarship; where mention has been made of every deceased editor that ever published a Greek Classic, with the exception of Winterton, Heskin, and Briggs. Of these Heskin merely reprinted Longepierre's edition of *Bion and Moschus*, just as the late Earl of Bridgewater did Valckenaar's *Hippolytus*. Briggs, however, whose emendations on the three Pastoral poets were first published in Gaisford's Theocritus, added some notes in his own work that exhibit, as in the case of his emendations on Æschylus which appeared in the *Classical Journal*, under the signature of Cantabrigiensis, rather the desire than the power to restore an author whose corruptions have defied the acuteness of a Scaliger, and the erudition of a Casaubon; and whose difficulties neither Daniel Heinsius and Thomas Warton could explain satisfactorily, nor Toup and Valckenaar united satisfactorily correct; while the labours of a Reiske and a Brunck, together with the whole herd of second-rate editors, such as Harles, Dale, Kiessling, De Góél, &c., have only shown how men mistake their powers, when, on the strength of a little Greek, they presume to set up for critics. Of Winterton, the cotemporary of Duport, still less could be said than of Briggs; nor would his name have been mentioned at all, for like Blackwall,

the editor of Theognis, he did nothing, had he not been the original collector of the Poeti Græci Minores, which Gaisford has reprinted in an improved form, and so valuable to the pocket of Dindorf; who is, to the Dean of Christchurch and to Bishop Blomfield, what a certain little parasitical animal is to the pigeon, a proof that the bird is in high feather and fit to be plucked for the use of German critical gourmands.

On looking over our list of editors we find we have omitted Baxter's Anacreon. But it is extremely doubtful whether the Anacreon we have is to be considered an ancient writer at all. We ought, perhaps, to add the editor of *Hermogenis Progy-mnasmata*, published in the *Classical Journal* from the MSS. papers of Ward, a professor in Gresham College, and which were sent to that periodical by the late Bishop Burgess. So too Dr. Foster gave an edition of Aratus in the same journal, accompanied with some notes merely explanatory.

It will be seen that we have paid no regard to the few critical pieces that have appeared in this country, but which were once so plentiful on the Continent, and especially in Holland, from the time of Canter to that of Wytttenbach, and which Schaefer once intended to collect into a "Thesaurus Criticus," the counterpart of Gruter's *Fax Artium*, partially reprinted in Italy. Such were Beardmore's *Specimens of Literary Resemblances* quoted in Barker's *Parriana*, II. p. 346., and Seager's *Conjecturæ in Scriptores Græcos*; to which may be added his *Emen-dations on Euripides, Aristophanes, Demosthenes, and Lucian*, published in the *Classical Journal*; together with the papers of a similar character by H. L(iston), J. W(eetman), Stackhouse, Sidney Walker, and Williams.

Nor have we taken any notice of the English versions, even when they were accompanied with notes, exhibiting an acquaintance with the original, which translators do not always possess. Such are Twining's *Aristotle's Poetics*, Vincent's *Voyage of Nearchus*, Bloomfield's *Thucydides*, Mitchell's, Wheelwright's and Walsh's *Aristophanes*, &c.

We have also designedly omitted all the editors of Latin works; for we feel, with Markland, that, when Greek scholarship shall be extinct Latin will not long survive; nor will all the hypocritical prayers of the *Edinburgh Review*, that Classical Literature, which has so long flourished in England, may continue to flourish there, prevent the ἀτέρμωνα νήγρετον ὕπνον it is destined to sleep. Besides, we could not, if we would, name scarcely a single editor, with the exception of Henry Allen, who since the time of Davis, Markland, Pearce, and Walker, has shewn himself

able to stand alone, much less to follow in their footsteps. The Dublin Walker, who edited Livy in 1797, was not the man to do so, as he was rather disposed to defend the absurdities of the text than to correct them. At that period this country was undergoing the severest trial that ever nation was destined to suffer. Famine stalking through the land. The mutiny at the Nore. The French every where victorious on land. All the crowned heads of Europe tottering on their thrones, and the people half-determined to throw themselves into the arms of the French, ready to give them the fraternal hug or to shoot them as foes. These scenes have indeed past away. But that which gave rise to them still lives—we mean the desire to throw all power into the hands of the masses, and to destroy all institutions that have the plague-spot, as it is called, of priestcraft. “Religious (says a writer, in the *British and Foreign Quarterly*) our teachers must be; religious according to the form and doctrine of the Church of England; learned they may be, as it happens, but *in orders they need not be, ought not to be, must not be*, unless we wish to bring back the past, with all its weaknesses and all its evils, and to restore the bounded, corporate, atomic life of the ages that are swept away.” But if our teachers must be religious and of the Church of England too, in form and doctrine, why not in orders? The answer is obvious. A man in orders cannot well change his creed; but a layman may be of one creed here and another there, the counterpart of the accommodating Vicar of Bray, to the great scandal of all creeds—the very result the Reviewer would wish to produce, although he cloaks his real purpose under a pretended love for the Church of England; for which he must in Scotland substitute the Kirk, and in Ireland the Catholic chapel; or else the very liberal gentleman will introduce the tyranny he is condemning, by compelling the Calvinist in Scotland and the Catholic in Ireland to receive as their teacher one, to whose faith they are necessarily opposed, as being contrary to their own, and whose doctrines they hold to be damnable. Of this outcry against teachers in orders he must be blind who cannot see the drift. It is to enable the Whigs to put a few more briefless barristers into snug births, by making men, who hoped to rise to the bench, look only to the birch; or, since flogging is now exploded, to become the superficial leaders to a race of juvenile Pantologists, who by the aid of Greek and Latin books with English notes, are to gallop over as much ground in two years as their fathers did in six, and to forget it all in one, instead of remembering their early studies through life, as did Burke, Fox, Pitt, Grattan, Grenville, and Canning, and the other leading men of the last days of England’s glory. Were the subject not too serious for laughter we could split our sides at witnessing the

folly of the heads of the Liverpool Institution ; who, desirous to make their town the centre of the *Belles Lettres*, as it is of raw cotton, determined to have a school on the last new pattern ; where children were to be taught every thing for nothing, and, like the vessel of a *cannie* owner, be worked by the fewest hands possible. Accordingly they advertized for gentlemen—heaven save the mark—to offer their services for two situations, one as a professor of Greek and Latin, and the other as the English master, who was to teach English Literature, Elocution, Composition, History, Geography, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy.

As soon as the advertisement caught the eye of a friend of ours, he wrote the letter following—not of course with the most distant idea of being the successful candidate—for he knew well that long before the advertisement appeared the places had been promised to those who happened to have friends at court—but solely with the view of shewing the Committee the absurdity of their plans :—

Gentlemen,—I find by the papers that you have invited all the needy, whose name is legion, and all the talented, whose numbers can be counted on the fingers, and to whom *ô, ç, rø* and *hic, hæc, hoc*, are play-things, to offer themselves for the high and honourable calling of teaching the boys, who dabble in the mud of the Mersey, to understand the language of those, who chace the mountain stream of the Ilissus, or float their miniature steamers on the more tranquil Tiber, in order that when the little dears shall have exchanged the school-room for the counting-house, they may be able to correspond in Romaic with dealers in Zante currants and Gallipoli oil, or give their orders for Florence silk in the *Bocca Toscana*. For such an office I may say, with Lingo, ‘I am the man ;’ and as I cannot imagine that a more eligible person will present himself—for if I did I should be a simpleton to be a candidate—I must e’en suppose myself already elected C. M. S. L. I., i. e. Classical Master in the School of the Liverpool Institution. One thing, however, gravels me. I find that while all the other masters have certain days and hours fixed for the attendance of their pupils, the Classical Master has none ; on the presumption, probably, that he will either have no pupils to attend, or the pupils no time to take a lesson. Now, though a sinecure is what most men sigh for, I confess I would rather teach the young idea how to shoot, than to stand, like a sun-dial, a mark for time to shoot at ; and I therefore beg leave to make the proposal following—You have advertised for an English master, also, who is to do indeed a great deal of work, but to receive for it the noble salary of 4*l.* 0*s.* 1*d.* per week, with the prospective increase to 1*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* per diem, when the number of pupils shall amount to 400. For such a prize none but the craven, who *sedit metuens ne non succederet*, would hesitate to enter his mule—and remember it was a mule-victory that Pindar celebrated in one of his boldest flights of

poetry—for the *steaks* and cup to be run for on the first of April. But where shall you find, except in the land of self-praising Scotchmen, the person who would undertake to teach eight sciences? And even a Scotchman would hardly venture upon English composition; for the thing would be just physically impossible, even if he united in his own person a Hume, a Robertson, and a Mackintosh. I must, therefore, conclude, as in the case of the classical master, I am your man; and by way of clenching the bargain, I will undertake both offices at a reduced salary, whose value will be known by the differential calculus, assuming the united salaries to be $2 \times £210 = \frac{210}{2}$

In making this proposal, I trust the friends of the Institution will do me the justice to believe that I have no design to grasp at a monopoly of honour and profit. My object is merely to exhibit my kind feelings towards an embryo establishment, whose motto is that of the illustrious Joseph Hume—'*Magnum vectigal est parsimonia*;' and thus the sincerity of my creed in political economy will be shewn at once, when it is seen how well I can practice the principles laid down by the advocates of cheapness, who tell us that an article can always command a market, if it be offered at a figure sufficiently low.

Of course I am aware that this offer will be considered too good to be true. But it is made, I assure you, gentlemen, in good faith; and as this letter will be the best proof of my power as a master of ancient and modern languages, I shall be prepared to transmit testimonials of the highest character, as soon as I am given to understand that the proposed saving of 105*l.* per annum is accepted by persons, who ought rather to double the salary than diminish it, if they would secure the services of efficient teachers; who should be paid, as a cabinet minister is, according to the talents which his office requires, rather than what he actually possesses; at least on this principle alone, can we defend the absurdity of remunerating equally an Eldon with much law and a Brougham with little, when holding respectively the same seat on the woolsack.

With regard to the subjects which the English master will be required to teach, I should like to know whether Political Economy is to be treated with an eye to the local interests of Liverpool, or the general advancement of truth? Whether, for instance, the corn-laws are to be decried, and the repeal of the duty of 5-16ths per lb. on cotton wool imported is to be advocated? For if any one-sided views are to be promulgated, it is evident that the teacher must be paid extra, as a salve for his conscience in putting forth what he knows to be false and suppressing what he knows to be true. Then as regards Mental Philosophy, are the Scotch metaphysicians to be followed through all their conflicting, unintelligible, and endless discussions, or will the teacher be permitted to put forth his own system, founded on the reasonings of men, before whom a Bacon would have bowed, had he been able to understand them in the original Greek? Equally uncertain is the course to be adopted in the Elocution department. Must the pupil be taught to stun the ears of the groundlings by his thunder from the hustings, or to put a congregation to sleep by the even flow of noiseless verbiage;

or to extort a verdict from a jury in Lancashire, which the next term is destined to set aside in Westminster Hall? Then, as to Composition, is the text-book to be the beauties of the *Edinburgh Review*, and especially the articles in favour of Reform, political, religious, municipal, and educational? or will the teacher be allowed to refer to the writings of those who have had the sagacity to predict that Reform will, like the French Revolution, end in the despotism of the masses, if the ballot be granted, or, if denied, in the slavery of the shopocrats? Lastly, is English Literature intended to be confined to the *Penny Magazine* and the other works published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, or to embrace the Saxon of Alfred; the Anglo-Norman of the Conqueror; the metrical and monkish chronicles of the Plantagenets; the tales of Chaucer; the dramas of Shakspeare; the divinity of the Reformation; the polemics of the Puritans; the chastity of the republican muse of Milton; the profligacy of the courtier pen of Rochester; the strength of Dryden; the coarseness of Swift; the polish of Pope; the ease of Addison; the flippancy of Walpole; the stiffness of Johnson; the acuteness of Hume; the gorgeousness of Gibbon; the growl of Cobbett; the morbid misanthropy of Byron; the fairy fancy of Shelley; the portrait-painting of Scott; and the philosophical colouring of Coleridge—or all and each of these to be rejected for that multitudinous sea of second-rate writers, whose works are valuable only as subjects of dissection in a school of anatomical critics, such as the reviewer of Lord Brougham's *Discourse on Natural Theology* in the *Church of England Quarterly*? I have the honor to be, Gentlemen, your most obedient,

OBTUS

To such a letter the writer of course received no answer; for the heads of the Committee were absolutely planet-struck at the bold language of a candidate, who, instead of going cap-in-hand, and soliciting the honour of the vote and interest of each member, sneered at the dispensers of patronage; while to their clever Secretary might be applied the description of Dædalus—

“Thrice he essayed his bosom's pangs to tell,
And thrice the goose-quill from his fingers fell.”

We trust, however, that for the benefit of the rising generation of Liverpool, the committee were led to see the folly of the new system of education, by which children are taught to be jacks-of-all-trades and masters of none. It was not thus that Mr. Ewart, the ex-member of Liverpool, was brought up; and a system that has enabled the Liverpoolians to point to that pride of a Reformed House of Commons ought not to be lightly discarded for another that will assuredly cause the New York pippin to degenerate into a Siberian crab. We know, indeed, that when another candidate expressed his astonishment that no time had been set apart for the attendance of the pupils on the Classical Master, the Secretary replied that “classical literature

was deemed of secondary importance; 'for,' said he, 'the ancients can teach us nothing.'"^{*}

That the ancients could not teach the moderns the art of flying paper kites, and all the tricks by which the dividends on railroads are paid out of borrowed money, and other bubbles are set afloat and kept up, like balloons, by inflation, must be admitted; and hence the absurdity of giving the youth of Liverpool any but a commercial education. But if the rich merchants of that place wish their children in after life to associate with men of liberal education, they must teach them what men of liberal education have learned to value, and take a delight in. Such things, however, are not to be obtained at any of the new colleges or schools; for there the attention of the pupils is directed to merely modern objects. Parr used to say that he never knew a person of fine taste in Literature brought up at a private school; and we will add, that no man ever made a figure in England who studiously neglected the dead languages. We have heard much, indeed, of the power of Cobbett's style and the purity of his English; but the power lay less in the writer than in the subjects, which were of absorbing interest, and rendered even more so by his personalities, where Billingsgate was ransacked for some happy term of abuse; while his purity was owing to his acquaintance with his prototype, Swift, whose knowledge of Latin served only to heighten the effect of his English. But granting even that a man, like Cobbett, could dispense with the dead languages, yet such characters, like the aloe, bloom only once in a century, and are never reared by any one system of education, but in defiance of all. Could Classical Literature claim no other merit, it would still deserve every support for the high tone of honourable feeling which it seldom fails to impart. With all his talents, Cobbett was a low-minded man, and but for his hostility to the bastiles the New Poor Laws, he would have lived and died without exhibiting a single trait chivalrous feeling. On the other hand, we will fearlessly appeal to the whole history of the past, and defy those, who sneer at Classical Literature, to produce a single individual, whose acquaintance with the words, thoughts, and deeds of the great men

^{*} If the Secretary of the Liverpool Institution will look into the B. and F. Q. Review, Vol. V. p. 176, he will find no little ridicule of those who, complaining that the ancients can teach us nothing, measure learning by the amount of the material produce it may be made to yield, and as they would a hogshead of Virginia tobacco, by the dollars it cost, and the pounds it brings just when made into real Havannah segars by the Jews of Houndsditch.

of Greece and Rome has not enlarged the sphere of his faculties, and preserved, except in the case of plagiarists, and men rendered reckless by poverty, his moral character untainted by the commission of a dishonorable act.

We cannot conclude this article better than by quoting the beautiful language of Fritzsche; who says, in his *Questiones Aristophanicae*, p. 29—

Literæ hæ non in foro tumultuantur, sed in otio et tranquillitate sese oblectant; non sub aspectum cadunt; non oculis cernuntur, aut tractari possunt manu; sed mentis acie suaque modestia pœne insciæ orbem terrarum gubernant; non divitias opesve quærunt, non regna concutiunt; nihil ipsæ affectant, sed honesta paupertate, fama, optimis artibus parta, et conscientia recti, thesauro omnium pulcherrimo contentæ sunt.

ART. VII.—1. *The Bubbles of Canada.* By the Author of "The Clockmaker." 8vo. London: R. Bentley. 1839.

2. *A Narrative.* By Sir FRANCIS B. HEAD, Bart. 8vo. London: John Murray. 1839.

IT very seldom falls to our lot to exercise our critical vocation on a work which, whether we consider the spirit in which it is written, the closeness of its reasoning, the cogency of its arguments, the clearness and vigour of its style, on all these grounds claims almost unqualified praise. When this does happen, the task is a very pleasing one. Such, we think we may say, is the case with regard to the first of the works before us. When we first took it up, we imagined, from the title, that we were about to peruse a book, clever doubtless, and which might probably present many curious facts to the reader, but, nevertheless, chiefly intended as a vehicle for wit and humour. We have been most agreeably disappointed; we use this term, not that we do not relish humour and wit occasionally, as well as others, but because we do not admire a too liberal use of them in questions involving weighty and important matters. Instead of answering to this description, we found it a work written in a grave and serious tone, combining clearness and force with eloquence of expression, by no means deficient in occasional strokes of wit and sarcasm, and containing, moreover, a complete exposition of the whole Canadian question. We have read many productions on this subject, but in most of them there has been observable either a greater or lesser degree of ignorance, a timid and irresolute mode of handling the question, or else an attempt only to grapple with its least important

points. But the author of the work before us acts very differently; he goes directly towards the more difficult parts of the question, pursues it through all its windings, and abandons it not until he has reduced it to a few simple points, easily intelligible by any capacity. It is singular that these should have escaped observation hitherto, or should have been noticed only in an imperfect manner, and that it should have been reserved to the present author to develop those errors, both of commission and omission, in which, as he shows by a chain of irrefragable reasoning, have originated all the doubts and difficulties with which the Canadian question has been embarrassed. We cannot sufficiently admire the fearlessness of tone, the honesty and sincerity of purpose, the determination not to blink at any part of his subject, and, at the same time, the perfectly temperate mode of expression, which are manifested in every page of this work. He sets out with a resolution of stating only unquestioned facts, which he leaves for the judgment of the reader; and we must say, he amply redeems his pledge. However, we will let him speak for himself:—

“After the late unhappy and wicked rebellion in Canada was suppressed, it was found necessary to punish with death a few of the most conspicuous traitors, for the atrocious murders they had committed in the Colonies; although the justice of this act was fully admitted, the necessity that existed for it was generally deplored. So much blood had been shed in the field, and so much misery entailed upon the country, by that rash and unprovoked revolt, that the people would gladly have been spared the spectacle of a further sacrifice of human life, if the outraged laws of the country had not imperatively called for retribution. They felt, too, that although nothing could justify their having desolated the country with fire and sword, in support of mere speculative points of government, some pity was due to deluded men, who had been seduced from their allegiance by promises of support, and direct encouragement to revolt, by people of influence and standing in the mother country; but although they knew that mischievous counsels had been given, they certainly were not prepared to hear similar sentiments publicly avowed in the Parliament of the nation. It was, therefore, not without mingled feelings of surprise and sorrow that they heard one honourable member invoke defeat and disgrace upon her Majesty's troops, whose service was already sufficiently painful without this aggravation; and a noble Lord, in another branch of the Legislature, denounce with indignant eloquence, the juries who had tried and the judges who had sentenced these convicted criminals.”

* * “Nor is the language held by my Lord Durham, in the recent valedictory proclamation, less surprising. He has thought proper, in that extraordinary document, to give the sanction of his high station to the popular error that the Canadas have been mis-governed.

“As this charge of mis-government has been often made of late, it is probable it will be repeated, and as it must materially modify the opinion we are to form, both of the revolt, and of the measures to be adopted hereafter in consequence thereof, I shall now proceed to controvert this assertion ; but before I enter upon it, permit me to say that I shall not treat this as a party question. As a colonist, at once a resident and a native of a distant part of the empire, I am not only unconnected with, but perfectly independent of, either of the great parties of this country, of Tories, or Whigs or Radicals ; nor do I consider this as a subject at all involving the principles for which they severally contend. The question is one wholly between the people of this country and the colonists, and must be considered as such ; and so far from my Lord Durham's assertion being true, that there has been misgovernment, I am prepared to show, that every Administration in this country, without exception, from the conquest of Canada to the present time, whether Tory or Whig, or mixed, or by whatever name they may be designated, have been actuated but by one feeling, an earnest desire to cultivate a good understanding with their new subjects of French extraction, and on one principle, a principle of concession. Canada has had more privileges and indulgences granted to it than any other of our American colonies: unpopular officers have been removed, obnoxious governors have been recalled, constitutional points abandoned to them, all reasonable changes made (or, as they would express it, grievances redressed), and the interests of commerce and of persons of British origin postponed to suit their convenience or accommodate their prejudices ; in short, every thing has been done, and every thing conceded, to conciliate them, that ingenuity could devise, or unbounded liberality grant, and no sacrifice has been considered too great to purchase their affections, short of yielding up the colony to their entire control ; and for all this forbearance and liberality they have met with ingratitude, abuse, and rebellion. For the truth of this assertion I call upon France and the United States to bear me testimony.

“Hear the Duke de la Rochefoucault Lioncourt :—‘No Canadian has just grounds of complaint against the British government ; the inhabitants of Canada acknowledge unanimously that they are better treated than under the ancient French government ; but they love the French, forget them not, long after them, hope for their arrival, will always love them, and betray these feelings too frequently, and in too frank a manner, not to incur the displeasure of the English. They pay no taxes, live well, at an easy rate, and in plenty ; within the compass of their comprehensions they cannot wish for any other good. They are so little acquainted with the principles of liberty, that it has cost a great deal of trouble to establish juries in their country : they oppose the introduction of the trial by jury ; in civil cases these are not yet in use. But they love France, this beloved country engages still their affections. In their estimation, a Frenchman is a being far superior to an Englishman.’

“Hear also Professor Silliman : ‘It is questionable whether any conquered country was ever better treated by its conquerors than Canada.

The people were left in complete possession of their religion, and revenues to support it; of their property, laws, customs, manners, and even the defence of their country is without expense to them; and it is a curious fact, that (unless by the great counterbalancing advantages it produces) so far from being a source of revenue, it is a charge on the treasury of the empire. It would seem as if the trouble and expense of government was taken off their hands, and as if they were left to enjoy their own domestic comforts without a drawback. Such is certainly the appearance of the population; and it is doubtful whether our own favoured communities are politically more happy.' " p. 8

After this statement, our author remarks very pithily—

"This, you will observe, is but the evidence of opinion: produce your facts." Agreed. To the facts then let us proceed:

By the treaty of peace which was made in the year 1763, Canada, which had been conquered by General Wolfe, was ceded in full sovereignty to the King of Great Britain, by the King of France, and the French inhabitants who chose to remain became British subjects, and were secured in the enjoyment of their property and possessions, and the free exercise of their religion. Shortly after this treaty, a royal proclamation was published for the purpose of creating four new civil governments, namely, those of Quebec, East Florida, West Florida, and Granada, in the countries and islands of America, which had been ceded to the crown by the same treaty. In this proclamation his Britannic Majesty exhorted all his subjects to avail themselves of those benefits and advantages which were likely to accrue from the recent valuable acquisitions, and as an encouragement to them to do so, the proclamation further stated, that directions had been given to the civil governors of these four new provinces to summon and call together, as soon as possible, general assemblies of the people within their respective governments, in the same manner as was practised in those provinces which were under his Majesty's immediate government, and that in the meantime, until such assemblies should be called, all persons inhabiting the said colonies might confide in his Majesty's royal protection, for the enjoyment of the benefit *of the laws of his realm of England*; for which purpose it was further stated that his Majesty had given directions to the said governors to erect and constitute courts of judicature for the hearing and determining all causes, both civil and criminal, as near as may be agreeable to the laws of England. And very shortly after this proclamation was published, a royal commission of Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the province of Quebec was issued to Major-General Murray, which was published by him

accordingly. In accordance with the terms of the proclamation and of his commission, Governor Murray and his council directed the chief justice of the province (who was to hold the Court of King's Bench) to determine all criminal and civil causes *agreeable to the laws of England*, and the ordinances of the province; and the judges of the inferior court (called the Court of Common Pleas) to determine the matters before them agreeably to equity, having regard, nevertheless, *to the laws of England*, so far as the circumstances and situation of things would permit, until such time as proper ordinances for the information of the people could be established by the Governor and council, agreeable to the laws of England, with this proviso added, "that the French laws and customs should be allowed and admitted in all causes in the said court, between the natives of the said province, in which the cause of action arose before the 1st day of October, 1764." In consequence of these instruments of government, the laws of England were generally introduced, and became the rule and measure of all contracts and other civil engagements entered into by the inhabitants after their introduction.

It was deemed expedient, as soon as possible, to introduce English settlers into the province, in order not only to create a defensive power within it, but also to induce the French to acquire the language and habits of their conquerors. The officers and soldiers who had served in America were rewarded with grants of land in the country, and liberal offers were made to emigrants. So many persons were induced to avail themselves of these offers as to afford grounds for the expectation that it would speedily rival the New England States in population and wealth; and there can be no doubt that such would have been the case, if the terms of the proclamation had been adhered to. The wisest course of policy which could have been adopted would undoubtedly have been to make the province a British colony in fact as well as in name. The introduction of English laws would have had a natural tendency to spread a knowledge of the language, by rendering its study necessary to the Canadian French, and an intercourse with the emigrants would have led the natives to adopt their customs, and by the time that a new generation had sprung up, it is probable that the Canadians would have ceased to feel any inconvenience from the change in their customs and laws. The first error in policy which was committed, and which in its consequences seemed likely to impede the gradual amalgamation of the different races of inhabitants, was the ordering a code of laws to be prepared, with such modifications contained in it as would secure to the French the

system of tenure and inheritance to which they had been accustomed. This occasioned much delay, and enabled the leaders of that party to represent that any change would tend to alienate the affections of the inhabitants. At this crisis the rebellion broke out in those colonies which afterwards became the United States of America, and this event rendered the conciliation of the Canadians a matter of policy. It was therefore determined at once to restore the French laws as they existed at the period of the conquest, and the Quebec Act, 14, Geo. III., c. 83, was passed for this purpose. The most important clause in this act was that which, after reciting that the English laws which had prevailed there for ten years, administered and regulated under commissions to governors, had been found inapplicable to the state and circumstances of the country, enacted that from and after the 1st of May, 1775, the said English laws and practice of courts should be annulled. It is true the criminal law of England was excepted, and the system of torture, which had been in force under the French domination, was abolished for ever. This act also constituted a council, with the power to make ordinances conjointly with the Governor, but not to impose taxes, except for making roads. The ordinances were to be laid before his Majesty for allowance.

This infraction of the promises held out in the proclamation, and of the terms upon the faith of which the emigrants of British origin had been induced to settle in the province, appear to have filled them with consternation. They felt that they must either abandon their property, and remove from the colony, or else remain there in the condition of a miserable minority, and submit to be ruled and governed by foreigners, who would only be conciliated by a forgetfulness on their part of their country, their language, and religion, and by their becoming, in short, Frenchmen. Petitions were accordingly prepared by them, in conjunction with those merchants of London who were interested in the North American trade, and presented to the King and the two Houses of Parliament, expressing their sense of the injury which they had sustained, and of the misery which was likely to be entailed upon the province by this act, but notwithstanding, no repeal was effected.

The fact, indeed, appears to be, that during the progress of this question from its commencement, the French Canadians have been continually making the most noisy applications for relief, which have been very frequently conceded, rather from the importunity of their character, than from any real claim which they might possess. The English inhabitants, on the

other hand, finding their opponents first in the field, have been compelled to act on the defensive, and instead of asking for what was due to themselves, have been obliged rather to remonstrate against too great a share being granted to their rivals. As the author observes—

“The advantage gained by this position the former (the French Canadians) have constantly maintained ; and it is a singular fact, that while the latter are the only aggrieved party in the country, the former have forestalled the attention of the public, and engrossed the whole of its sympathy. Every page of this work will confirm and illustrate this extraordinary fact.” p. 33.

After the independence of the United States had been recognized, a large emigration of loyalists from those states took place into Canada, comprising a great number of persons of character and property ; and these persons having been accustomed to the exercise of the electoral franchise, united with those of their countrymen, who had before settled in that province, in asking for a modification of the Quebec Act and the establishment of a local legislature. The result of their petitions was the passing of the Constitutional Act of the Canadas, 31 Geo. 3, c. 31, to which and the Quebec Act, 14 Geo. 3, c. 83, according to our author, is to be attributed all the trouble which has been experienced in governing Canada. The concessions to the Canadians contained in these acts gave origin to that anti-British feeling which, as it sprung out of the powers given by these statutes, so has it increased with every exercise of them, “until it has assumed the shape of concentrated hatred and open rebellion.” By the Constitutional Act Canada was divided into two provinces, the Upper and the Lower, to the latter of which the author states that his remarks in the present work apply.

A constitution was given by this act to the lower province, consisting of a Governor and Executive Council of eleven members, appointed by the Crown, a Legislative Council forming the second estate, consisting of fifteen members, also appointed by the Crown (but afterwards increased to forty), and a Representative Assembly composed of fifty members, afterwards increased to eighty-eight. The enacting power given to the colony by these assemblies, introduced from year to year another set of statutes in addition to those which already prevailed, so that the colony at present possesses a union of French, English, and provincial law. It is scarcely possible to judge of the difficulties arising from such a confusion of laws, without examining into their structure. The author has accordingly entered into a detailed account of their nature, which we shall endeavour to abridge for the benefit of our readers.

It seems that there exists in Lower Canada no regular code in which the laws of the country are systematically incorporated. The jurisprudence of the country embraces the French, the English, and the Roman or civil laws; and these are so blended in practice, that it is frequently doubtful from which of them the rule of decision will be drawn. The statute law of the province may be classed under five heads:

“First.—The articles of capitulation, that form part of the guaranteed rights of the inhabitants.”

“Second.—The 31 Geo. III. cap. 31, or the Constitutional Act, and all other British statutes expressly extending to the colonies.”

“Third.—The edicts, declarations, and ordinances of the Kings of France officially registered in the province.”

“Fourth.—The ordinances of the governor and council anterior to 1792:” and

“Fifth.—The Acts of the Provincial Legislature, subsequent to 1792.

“The common law is the custom of Paris as modified by the customs of the country, and this law was co-extensive with the whole province, until the passing of the Canada Tenures Bill, in 1825, which restricted the application of the French law to the feudal section of the colony, and introduced bodily the English laws to the remainder of the province. The criminal law of the province is the English code as it stood in 1774, and the statutes of a declaratory or modifying nature that have since passed the local legislature. When the country was first settled by the French, the feudal tenure was in full vigour on the continent of Europe, and naturally transported by the colonizers to the new world. The King of France, as feudal lord, granted to nobles and respectable families, or to officers of the army, large tracts of land, termed seigniories, the proprietors of which were termed seigneurs, and held immediately from the King *en fief*, or *en roture*, on condition of rendering fealty and homage on accession to seigniorial property; and in the event of a transfer, by sale, or gift, or otherwise (except in hereditary succession), the seignior was subject to the payment of a *quint*, or fifth part of the whole purchase money; and which, if paid by the purchaser immediately, entitled him to the *rabot*, or a reduction of two-thirds of the *quint*.”

Amongst other peculiarities belonging to this law, as it exists in Canada, is the following:—Whenever an estate is sold within any seignior, the seigneur is entitled to demand a sum equal in amount to one-twelfth part of the purchase money, to be paid by the purchaser of the estate, over and above the purchase money itself; and the seigneur has also the privilege called the *droit de retrait*, which allows him, at any time within the period of forty days after the sale has taken place, to purchase the estate at the highest bidden price.

The substitution of such an extraordinary code of laws as this for the English law, could produce nothing but discord in a country inhabited by two races of different origin and speaking different languages. The inhabitants of French origin, jealous of innovation, are constantly suspecting an intention on the part of those of English descent to infringe upon their rights, and to introduce their own system of jurisprudence. On the other hand, the inhabitants of British race, naturally of an enterprising and commercial character, consider the feudal tenure as an intolerable burthen, and are indignant at the species of subjection under which they are placed to a race of people whom they have conquered, and to the operation of laws which do not exist in the land from which they have sprung. In addition to this error of establishing such a code of laws as we have spoken of, three others, equal in extent, were also committed. First in dividing Canada into two provinces, and by this means separating the French from the majority of the English. Secondly, in allowing the use of the French language in the courts of justice and in the records of the legislature. And, thirdly, in giving at so early a period, and before the people were in a proper state for its reception, a constitutional form of government to the country. Previous to the English conquest these people had been accustomed to a despotic rule; they were almost totally uncultivated, few of them indeed being able to read or write, and the habits of implicit obedience towards their superiors in which they had been trained, rendered them little able to comprehend the nature of those rights which were given to them by a constitution. The French governors and intendants under whom they were formerly placed, exercised an unbounded power, and in their decisions were usually actuated by their own caprice. The inhabitants were compelled to serve without pay in the wars with the English, and were accustomed to experience great severity from their superiors. The exactions of the military were rather encouraged than restrained, and if on any occasion remonstrances against oppression were transmitted to France, they were usually either disregarded or else suppressed. To confer a constitution on such a people, with such customs and habits, can scarcely be termed other than an act of Quixotic folly. The motive for such an act was doubtless kind and good; the English accustomed to the blessings resulting from their own invaluable constitution, were perhaps somewhat too anxious to impart the advantages which they enjoyed to others, and in the wish to be generous forgot the necessity of being wise. The fact is, the mere circumstance of being transferred from the tyranny of their colonial governors, and passing under the sway of the Bri-

tish Crown, was in itself a blessing much more than sufficient to counterbalance the pain and regret arising from subjection to a foreign race. A constitution is not to be made in a day, nor are the persons proper to enjoy such a form of government to be trained up for its reception in an equal space of time. The constitution of England is the growth of centuries, and the result of the successive wisdom and experience of ages, and the people who live under it have advanced step by step with its progress, so that the one may be said to be identified with the other. To give such a constitution as this to a set of ignorant boors, totally unaccustomed to free usages and institutions, and unripe for their exercise, was in truth a literal exemplification of the Scripture saying—a casting of pearls before swine; and the consequences of such a piece of folly have completely fulfilled the latter part of that remarkable saying, for the subjects of this act of misplaced liberality have turned on and wounded their benefactors.

The great object should have been to render the separation which already existed between the two races less marked by every possible means. But the very reverse of this seems to have taken place. In accordance with the fatal principle of conciliation which has been recognized as the rule of action, the most effectual methods were adopted to render the distinction striking and permanent. The French were entrusted with an almost exclusive possession of the popular branch of the legislature, and were moreover constituted toll-keepers to the adjoining province of Upper Canada. The ports of Quebec and Montreal were assigned to Lower Canada, and thus came into the hands of the French Canadians, and the inhabitants of Upper Canada were by this arrangement cut off from all communication with the mother country, with the exception of such as might be granted to them by the Americans or their French neighbours.

The author commences his fifth letter by stating :

“ Having thus traced historically the measures of government, from the conquest of the country to the time when the Constitutional Act went into operation in the province (December 26th, 1791), which forms the first important epoch in the history of the colony, I shall divide the time that intervened between that period and the present into four other portions. The second extends from the meeting of the first provincial House of Assembly, in December, 1792, to 1818, when a demand was made for a civil list; the third from thence to 1828, when the pretensions of the Assembly had assumed a distinct and definite form, and were referred to a committee of Parliament; the fourth from thence to 1834, when a further reference of additional grievances was

made to another Parliament committee; and the fifth from 1834 to the present period. Such a division will elucidate the growth and increase of those revolutionary principles (the natural and obvious result of such a form of government) which first appeared in an insidious attempt to monopolize the whole civil power, by such a complete control in matters of legislation and finance, as would render her Majesty's representative, and the Legislative Council, subservient to the interests, prejudices, and passions of the French Canadian majority, and finally terminated in open rebellion. I do not mean by this to affirm that all that has since transpired was the result of a preconceived design, systematically acted upon; but as uncontrolled power was given by the constitution to the French party, that these pretensions were the natural result of such a power, and that they were unhesitatingly put forward as soon as their leaders had become acquainted with the workings of the constitution, and aware that they were invested with the means of imposing their own terms upon government." p. 54.

The first Assembly met on the 17th of December, 1792, and as the representation had been most injudiciously based upon the principle of population, 35 out of the 50 members of the House were French, and only 15 English; a minority too large to be agreeable to the stronger party, and therefore permitted only to continue so long as would suffice for teaching the majority the forms of business, for we find it at a later period *reduced to three*. The change from the arbitrary form of government, under which they had hitherto lived, to constitutional rule was so great that the French appear to have made some display of grateful feeling for a certain period. In one of their addresses to the King, they thus express their sense of his mild and paternal government :—

"SIR,—Your most obedient and faithful new subjects in the provinces of Canada take the liberty to prostrate themselves at the foot of your throne, in order to lay before you the sentiments of respect, affection, and obedience towards your august person with which their hearts overflow, and to return to your Majesty their most humble thanks for your paternal care of their welfare."

For some time the majority behaved with decorum and moderation; but notwithstanding this propriety of demeanour, feelings of alarm at the probable consequences likely to result from such a disproportion seem very soon to have manifested themselves, even among those persons who had at first been favourable to the introduction of English institutions, when they found the house proceeding to choose a speaker, who allowed his inability to speak English, and also resorting to the practice of recording their proceedings in the French language. It was soon perceived that the result would be that Englishmen would

be forced to study French, and in a certain degree to become Frenchmen, and in this manner a complete ascendancy would be given to the French portion of the inhabitants, not only as regarded their laws, but also in their language and habits. Such concessions to the French party were the more extraordinary, since it appears that the government of the United States, on occasion of admitting the state of Louisiana, which was inhabited by Frenchmen, as a member of the confederation, enacted that the proceedings in the courts and legislature of this state should be exclusively recorded in the language of the parent states. The consequence is, that the inhabitants of Louisiana now generally speak or understand English, and have changed their old laws for a new code, whilst the legislature and people of Lower Canada remain as much French as the inhabitants of Normandy.

The English party soon appear to have felt that, as far as they themselves were concerned, this constitution was little more than a delusion. They were obliged to have recourse to the manoeuvre of absenting themselves from the house when any obnoxious measures were to be considered, and thus compelling the Speaker to adjourn the debate from want of a sufficient number to form a house.

This first house, after four sessions, terminated on the 4th of May, 1796. Although the conduct of the members to the governor was respectful, they made it manifest that they were determined to afford no encouragement to English commerce or English settlers. They adopted the principle of avoiding all direct assessment, and of throwing all the public burthens and local charges upon the revenue, which was derived from duties levied on trade. As a proof of the spirit by which they appear already to have been actuated, the following instance speaks very decisively. A road act of great importance to the country at large, but which imposed a small money or labour contribution on the people, was carried through the Assembly by the influence of the governor. But the embryo demagogues of the time would not suffer so wholesome a measure as this to pass off quietly, and by representing it as the beginning of foreign taxation and English oppression, excited the passions and prejudices of the people to such a degree, that they even attempted to starve out the inhabitants of Quebec and Montreal, by withholding all the usual supplies of food. They also refused to enact a bankrupt law, when requested by the merchants to pass such a one, and declined to pass an "Act to amend the laws, customs, and usages in force in the pro-

vince relative to the tenure of lands, and the rights derived therefrom."

They appear, indeed, to have been obstinately determined against any innovation upon the French laws, which, together with the feudal tenures of lands, they were bent upon preserving, as the best means for preventing English emigrants from settling in the province. In this house also it appears that the first attempt was made to encroach on the rights of the Crown, which took place in an inquiry which was instituted into the forfeited lands of the Jesuits, and a claim which was made for their restoration to French control:

"Thus, my dear friend, do you see that the causes of the present posture of affairs are to be traced back to a very early period, not, as my Lord Durham has asserted, to misgovernment of the Canadians, but to inconsiderate concessions, which, though designed to conciliate them, have not only signally failed of their object, but been productive of mischief to themselves and incalculable injury to the colony." p. 61.

The second House of Assembly was opened on the 25th of January, 1797, and terminated its sittings in 1800. This was much more democratic than the previous one, and although the minority was only reduced to 14, the British interest was evidently already on the decline. A manifest change had now taken place in the feelings of the different branches of the legislature. The Governor, contented with acting on the defensive, no longer proposed measures of internal improvement, which he was well assured would either provoke angry discussion, or else meet with a refusal; and relied more upon the Legislative Council, which alone represented British interests, whilst the House of Assembly, finding that temporary acts had a tendency to lessen the independence of the Executive, ceased to pass any of a permanent nature. As a proof of the spirit by which the Assembly was influenced, it may be sufficient to state that the minority having proposed to establish a qualification in order to remedy the evil of having so many illiterate and prejudiced members, this measure, although it could not have increased their own numbers, yet, because it was introduced by the English party, was immediately considered to be of foreign origin, and was instantly rejected.

The third provincial parliament began on the 1st of January, 1801, and terminated, after, five sessions, on the 2nd of May, 1804. The temper of this house, and the relative proportions between the parties in it, were similar to the last. Among the chief points contained in the speech of the governor to this As-

sembly, was a recommendation for a grant of money to be made, for the use of the free schools for the instruction of the rising generation in the first rudiments of useful learning and in the *English tongue*. Singular to say, the house, in its reply, omitted the words "English tongue," and shortly after supplied the omission by a vote for the purchase of "French books" for the use of the members. Unfortunately for the literary reputation of this house, it so happened that a great many of its members were equally incapable of reading either language. Such a preference for French laws was exhibited by this house, that an act was passed to revive the *serment decisoire*, or oath, by which, under certain circumstances, a debtor may be permitted to clear himself of a commercial debt, by simply swearing to its having been paid and satisfied, without even stating the time or place of payment; a process which has been described as a most prolific source of fraud and perjury, and deeply injurious to the mercantile interests of the country, as well as to the character of the people. The factious spirit had by this time proceeded to such lengths, that the leaders of the Canadian party affected now to perceive a latent danger in every act of the government, so much so, that a bill requiring rectors, curates, and priests, to read certain laws after Divine service, was denounced as opening a door for exercising an influence over the clergy; and an attempt was made to substitute for them, in the performance of this duty, the captains of militia, which was only relinquished in order to avoid making the awkward admission that many of these officers were unable to read. The increase of trade also in the province, which took place in consequence of the war, instead of exciting the emulation of the French Canadians, only served to awaken their jealousy. They not only declined to aid in extending it, but actually imposed taxes upon it for all those purposes which elsewhere in America are provided for by local assessment. Such conduct as this, of course, had the effect of retarding the progress of Lower Canada towards prosperity.

In the fourth House of Assembly, which met on the 11th of January, 1805, and terminated, after four sessions, on the 14th of April, 1808, the French and democratical party displayed still more factious spirit. The pressure of the feudal tenure having become still more severely felt by the inhabitants of the cities, an attempt was now made to obtain some alteration in it. A bill was brought in to abolish the *retrait lignager*, a right of redemption by the relations of seignoral lands. According to the provisions of this law, any relation of the seller, if of the

same line from whence the property descended, might, within a year and a day, take it from the purchaser on condition of returning the price. Consequently, a person having purchased a lot of land for a 100*l.*, and having expended upon it 1000*l.* in buildings, might be deprived of the whole by a relation of the seller, upon receiving back only the original purchase money, buildings not being considered necessary expenses. A bill was also introduced in order to enable the seigneurs to compound for their feudal rights and dues with their vassals and censitaires. This was intended as a relief against the effects of lods and vents, by which the twelfth part of the labour and expense of erecting buildings on ground subject to the imposition was for the benefit of the seigneur. However, neither of these measures was passed, nor was any remedy applied until the Imperial Parliament interfered nearly twenty years afterwards. At the same time that they rejected these useful and necessary measures, they voted 750*l.* for translating Hatsell's *Parliamentary Proceedings* into French; and by way of showing that they were not inattentive to the agricultural prosperity of the province, they passed a bill enjoining the application of tar to apple-trees for the destruction of caterpillars. The merchants and other British subjects resident in Canada, finding that all attempts in the legislature were useless, appealed to the English public. They contended that if the support of the civil government were not to rest on direct taxes, it should at least be secured by permanent indirect taxes; that local establishments should be kept up by assessments on the districts for whose benefit they were required. This proceeding was denounced by the demagogues of the time as an attack upon the liberties of the subject, and certain toasts given at a public dinner, approving of these commercial and financial views of the minority, were voted to be an insult to the house, and warrants were issued against the parties, who were taken into custody and compelled to apologize. After these proceedings the house commenced a system of high-handed measures against every person who should presume to obstruct their views, and followed it up by removing from the Assembly all persons attached to the Executive, and by impeaching others holding high official stations, with the hope that by representing the adherents of government as enemies to the country, they would be able to alienate the affections of the people from their rulers, and to prepare them to join in those measures of forcible resistance which appear now to have been first contemplated.

The fifth Provincial Parliament was opened by Sir James

Craig, on the 10th of April, 1809, when the attention of the members was called to the unsettled state of affairs as regarded the Americans, and they were required to consider of the proper course to be adopted in order to place the province in a state of defence. Instead of proceeding to deliberate on this pressing emergency, they commenced by attacking the judges, and devising means to remove them from the legislature, and exhibited so much heat in their proceedings, and such a disrespectful want of attention to the subject which had been submitted to them, that after five weeks of angry discussion the Governor dissolved the Assembly.

In the sixth Parliament, which met on the 29th of January, 1810, the Governor began by informing the members that he was instructed to assent to any bill for rendering the judges in future ineligible to sit in the Assembly, to which the two houses should agree. The House of Assembly, however, although a little quieted by the firmness of the Governor, was not to be diverted from its schemes of ambition; "and now, for the first time, was developed that deep-laid plan, which has since so signally succeeded, of placing every officer of the government at the mercy of the popular branch, and rendering the arm of the executive perfectly powerless." On the 10th of February, they resolved, most unexpectedly, "that this house will vote in this session the necessary sums for defraying the civil expenses of the government of this province." They considered the prosperous state of the revenue which was caused by the American embargo, as a favourable opportunity for assuming the management of the civil list, and thus obtaining a control over the officers of the government, who would, by this measure, be left at the mercy of the house. As long as the expenditure of the civil establishment exceeded the revenue derived from taxes on commerce, they were perfectly content to allow the deficiency to be supplied by Parliament; but now that the treasury was more than equal to this charge, they imagined that a voluntary offer of the kind above-mentioned might throw the Governor off his guard, and would probably be accepted. The Governor, however, saw through their design, and with great prudence answered that it would be necessary to obtain the concurrence of the Legislative Council, but that he would transmit their address to his Majesty. A bill for disqualifying the judges was next passed, and sent to the Legislative Council, who agreed to it, with the proviso, that it should not come into operation until the end of the session. Upon this the House of Assembly instantly expelled the judges by resolu-

tion. The Governor, after this violent conduct, immediately dissolved the Assembly, and appealed again to the sense of the people. "But here unhappily," observes the author, "there was no public opinion to appeal to."

The seventh House of Assembly met on the 12th of December, 1810, and the English minority was now reduced to nine. In the meantime, the Governor was induced, in consequence of the seditious and revolutionary doctrines which were disseminated by a paper called *The Canadian*, to seize upon the presses of this journal, and to imprison the conductors; and it was probably owing to this firm and decided measure, and to the determination manifested in dissolving the former house, that the present one became more subdued in its tone. The prompt check which had been interposed by the executive to the violation of constitutional rights, in the expulsion of the judges, produced its effect, and the house now passed a bill for disqualifying the judges, which received the Governor's assent. In the mean time Sir G. Prevost arrived to take upon him the government; "and," observes the author, "we are indebted to the determined attitude assumed by his predecessor, to the hereditary hatred borne by the Canadians to the Americans, to the fear they entertained of passing into the hands of an uncompromising people, and to the large sum expended upon the embodied militia, that they did not then avail themselves of the opportunity of throwing off the dependence which it has since been their unceasing object to effect." The house then proceeded to impeach the judges, in order that they might bring the government into contempt; and when the Governor refused to suspend these functionaries until the result of the charges against them should be known, they actually resolved

"That his Excellency the Governor-in-Chief, by his answer to the address of the house, had violated the constitutional rights and privileges thereof."

"Sufficient has now been said to show you that the evils of Canada have their origin in the defects of the Constitutional Act, which by substituting French for English laws, by securing to them an overwhelming majority in the Assembly, and in separating them from Upper Canada, have had the effect of making them a French and not an English colony. National antipathies, added to a difference in religion, laws, and language, have contributed to engender and foster a feeling of hostility between the two races, until it has found vent in open collision. It would exceed the limits I have assigned to myself to review the proceedings of each separate house; suffice it to say, that the system of persecution, the commencement of which I have exhibited in the foregoing pages, was subsequently pursued with unmitigated zeal. Having driven the judges from the house (though they

failed in the impeachment), they succeeded in extorting from government their discharge from the council. They then vacated the seats of executive councillors by the unconstitutional mode of resolution, and finding there were no means of controlling their power, proceeded by repeated expulsions to drive out a member for advice offered to the Governor in a ministerial capacity; and reprimanded another officer for legal opinions given to the executive in the usual course of his profession. Every thing was done that ingenuity could devise, not only to weaken the influence of government, but to represent their influence as unfriendly to the country, and prejudicial to its interests. Nothing, however, occurred until the year 1818 to bring them into direct collision with the mother country, until Sir John Sherbrooke demanded that they should provide for the civil expenses of the province." p. 82.

After numerous discussions had taken place, both with respect to the gross amount to be granted, and the manner of its appropriation, the Assembly took the extraordinary ground of disputing the right of the Crown to those revenues which were secured to it by permanent grants.

In order that this question may be properly understood, it will be necessary to state the sources from which the public income of Lower Canada is derived, which are;—first, the Crown duties levied under the British statute, 14 Geo. 3, or the imperial act of 3 Geo. 4; second, provincial duties payable in virtue of the local laws, proceeding immediately from the provincial legislature, or rendered permanent, without their consent, by the last mentioned imperial act; third, the Queen's casual and territorial revenue, which arises from her Majesty's landed property; namely, the Jesuit's estate, the Queen's posts, the forges of St. Maurice, the Queen's wharf, droit de quint, lods and vents, land fund, and timber fund. Of these, the Crown duties and the territorial revenue had always been controlled and dispensed by the responsible servants of the Crown, whilst those levied under the imperial act of 3 Geo. 4, and all provincial acts, have always been under the disposal of the legislature. As the Crown duties had generally been inadequate to the support of the civil government and the administration of justice, Sir J. Sherbrooke was instructed to call upon the legislature to appropriate out of the provincial duties a sum equal to the annual deficiency. Instead of granting this, they alleged that the Crown duties were illegal; a plea set up by them merely because they were not under their control, and their present object was to render the executive dependent upon an annual vote of the house for its support. The disputes, with regard to these duties, extended over the whole administrations of the Duke of Richmond, Lord Dalhousie, and Sir J. Kempt, and the final result was, that de-

legates were chosen to demand a redress of grievances from the Imperial Parliament. The English have always been disposed to govern their colonies with justice and kindness, and these delegates, therefore, experienced a favourable reception. Their complaints were referred to a committee, which, after a patient and laborious investigation, made a report which was acknowledged by the Assembly itself to be able, impartial, and satisfactory; and it appears that the recommendations of this committee, as far as depended upon the government, were most fully and strictly complied with. But the factious party in Canada were not yet contented, and they again assumed an attitude of complaint. "They set themselves busily to work to improve their advantages, and having established themselves in the outworks which were thus surrendered to them, they now turned their attention to storming the citadel." Fourteen resolutions were passed by the Assembly, in which they embodied some of their old, and added new grievances, and an agent was also appointed to advocate their claims. Whilst these complaints, which proceeded only from one portion of the people, were forwarded to the mother country, the settlers of British origin complained loudly that they were unrepresented, and that they had no constitutional means of being heard. The French party in the Assembly upon this, fearing that these remonstrances, which were so well founded, might perhaps be redressed in the same quarter where they themselves had met with so much success, affected to listen to their petitions, and made a new electoral division of the province. Those territories which were principally inhabited by persons of French origin were divided into numerous small counties, whilst others, where a large body of those of British origin resided, were divided in such a manner, that by being joined to others possessing a greater number of French inhabitants, the votes of the British were rendered ineffectual. In addition to this division, the extreme partiality of which has never been doubted, they established the quorum of the house, for the transaction of business, at forty, only four less than the half of the whole Assembly. By this last measure the influence of the minority was still further depressed, and the majority was enabled at pleasure to deprive it of its proper parliamentary privileges, by rendering the transaction of business impossible, except when it suited the convenience of the stronger party to allow it. They also took the extraordinary step of resolving that if the Legislative Council should not agree to a bill for paying an emissary from the Assembly to England, they would pay him out of the public revenue, without the concurrence of that body. And by way of adding with still more contempt towards the Council, and evincing

their determination to legislate for the colony by their own sole authority, as well as for the purpose of stigmatising the officers of the government, they resolved that until such time as the royal assent should be given to a bill for vacating the seats of members accepting offices, "the seat of any member of this house, who shall accept of any office, or place of profit, under the Crown, in this province, or become accountable for any public money hereafter appropriated within this province, shall, by this acceptance, be deemed by this house to be vacant."

At the same time it seems that whilst they refused to the government the means of paying its officers, they were most prodigal of the public money upon themselves and their dependents. There were certain funds appropriated to the contingent expenses of the house, and, according to law, neither the house nor any of its officers had any right to apply them to any other purpose. The expenses for printing alone, during the year 1831, for the Assembly, at one only of its favourite establishments, was considerably over 5,000*l.*, exclusive of other presses; and this sum was also exclusive of the cost of printing the laws or of the expenses of the Council. "Pretexts were not wanted, where the disposition existed, to provide for their dependents. A subpoena was all that was necessary to obtain a warrant for a gratuity, which, to one individual, covered a charge of 120*l.*, and on one petition amounted to 700*l.* 'Some witnesses,' says a gentleman of the bar at Quebec, 'one sees as regularly, about a fortnight after the sessions, as swallows in spring; and although they do not last quite so long, yet they hardly leave Quebec before either the house or the roads break up.' It will hardly be credited that the house which is so clamorous for cheap government, expends on itself *thirteen thousand pounds a year*, one thousand of which is paid to Mr. Papineau, *the patriot*; and that the gross amount of the legislative expenses is 18,000*l.* Some idea of the purity of our 'enslaved and oppressed brethren' may be formed from the fact that, previous to 1829, the amount of moneys voted for education had not exceeded 2,500*l.* At that period it was found it could be turned to a better account than education; they therefore constituted the members of the house visitors of the schools in the counties they represent; the money being drawn on their certificates only, to which by law they are privileged to affix their crosses, instead of the more difficult process of writing their names. Since then the grants have wonderfully increased:—

"In 1830	-	-	-	-	£27,840
1831	-	-	-	-	25,261
1832	-	-	-	-	29,233
1833	-	-	-	-	22,500"

We have now traced the progress of faction and discontent in the colony up to the year 1832, at which period every grievance had been removed, as far as it lay with the government. Whatever required the co-operation of the Assembly still remained unredressed. It would seem that they had asked what they did not require, and hoped also would not be granted, in order that a refusal might serve as a pretext for further agitation. No impediment to the public tranquillity now remained, and if the intention of the complaining party had been honest, Canadian discontent would have terminated. Several persons of character and station in the colony, who had up to this time acted with the French faction, separated themselves from it, declaring that they had obtained all and more than they had sought. In the sensible language of the author—

“When they found that there was no corresponding feeling in the breasts of their colleagues, and that these concessions were merely used as the ground-work of further changes, they became alarmed, and for the first time were made sensible of what the public had always known with unfeigned sorrow, that they had been all along the dupes of their own liberal notions and the artifices of others. They had now full time to reflect upon the mischief they had done, and their own inability to make réparation, and have added another illustration, to the numbers we already have on record, of how much easier it is to open the flood-gates of popular prejudice and passion, than to close them against the force of the current. They are now likely to become the victims of their own folly, and to be overwhelmed in the ruins caused by the inundation to which they have unfortunately contributed by cutting away the embankments. It is to be hoped that the lesson will not be lost upon England; and it may, perhaps, afford these unhappy men some consolation, if the safety of others is confirmed by the contemplation of the fatal effects of their folly.”

The Assembly, after being requested by the Governor to bring forward all their demands at once, if they had any yet remaining, as otherwise he should feel entitled to report that there were no others, remained silent, and it was naturally concluded by him that they had exhausted their budget of grievances. After this conduct, great, as may be supposed, was the surprise excited, when it was found, in the year 1834, that they were prepared to come forward with ninety-two resolutions, embodying fresh grievances.

“This extraordinary step revived the hopes of every loyalist throughout the adjoining colonies. ‘Surely,’ they said, ‘this last ungrateful, unprovoked attempt will open the eyes of the English nation to the ulterior views of Papineau and his party. It takes much provocation to arouse the British lion; but surely this last thrust will be more than he can bear! He will make his voice to be heard across the waters,

and sedition will fly terrified to its cover. But, alas! they were mistaken. Noble and spirited as the animal once was, he is now old and infirm: a timid people have filed his teeth and shortened his claws, and stupefied him with drugs, and his natural pride disdains to exhibit an unsuccessful imbecility. It was received with a meekness and mildness that filled every body that had known him in former years with astonishment and pity; they could not recognise in the timid and crouching creature before them, the same animal whose indomitable courage and muscular strength had formerly conquered those same Canadians, even when supported by all the resources of France, who now, single-handed and alone, defied him to combat. But this is too painful a picture to dwell upon." p. 133.

These celebrated resolutions are too well known, even if their length did not present a sufficient objection, to render it necessary to insert them here. They were referred, together with the memorial which accompanied them, to a committee composed chiefly of liberal members. The Canadian delegate, Mr. Morin, was heard at great length, and his examination presents a curious picture of the manner in which a clever man, as he appears to have been, was brought to refute himself. The committee reported (June, 1834) to the following effect:—

"That the most earnest anxiety had existed, on the part of the home government, to carry into effect the suggestions of the committee of 1828; and that the endeavours of the government to that end had been unremitting, and guided by the desire, in all cases, to promote the interests of the colony; and that in several important particulars their endeavours had been completely successful; that in others, however, they had not been attended with that success which might have been anticipated; heats, and animosities, and differences having arisen; that it appeared to the committee some mutual misconception had prevailed; and that they believed that they should best discharge their duty by withholding any further opinion on the points in dispute; and were persuaded the practical measures for the future administration of Lower Canada might best be left to the mature consideration of the government responsible for their adoption and execution."

At this period in his narrative, our author inserts the statement drawn up by Lord Aberdeen, in which his lordship claimed for himself and his colleagues the credit of a full and faithful compliance with the recommendations of the Canada committee, as far as the powers of the executive permitted them to do so. This statement he characterizes as a most able and lucid one, a description in the justice of which all who are acquainted with the talents of his lordship will agree. We wish we had space to insert some extracts from this paper, but we must content ourselves with quoting the very pithy observations of the author upon it:

"The perusal of this triumphant document naturally suggests two

reflections: first, that the faithful execution of the recommendations of the committee is much more entitled to our approbation than the recommendations themselves; and, secondly, that the Canadian Assembly were not to be satisfied with any concession whatever, short of independence."

Our readers are doubtless aware that a commission of enquiry, of which Lord Gosford, the governor, was the head, was sent out in 1835. Everything that was tangible in the ninety-two resolutions, was put into shape, and separately commented upon for the guidance of the Governor, in a document drawn up by Lord Glenelg. The first head of inquiry contained in this paper, which relates to the allegation of patronage in Lower Canada having been exercised in such a manner as to exclude the Canadians of French descent, calls forth from the author such a singular statement of facts as we are sure our readers will be surprised to hear:—

"Had his lordship thought proper to have entered into particulars, he might have compiled the following table, to show how utterly false this accusation was. He might also have stated that the appointments contained in this table were made under every possible disadvantage, in consequence of the avowed hostility of the French to the government and institutions of the English, and also from the extreme difficulty of sending persons among them competent to discharge the duties assigned; and might have illustrated the last assertion by reference to the fact *that out of two grand juries at this time at Montreal, only one person was found that could write his name.* Of the last seven hundred and thirty-eight appointments the proportion stood thus:—

Of French origin	557
Of British and Foreign	181
	<hr/>
	738

APPOINTMENTS.	OF FRENCH ORIGIN.	OF BRITISH OR FOREIGN.
To the Legislative Council.....	18	11
To the Executive Council.....	5	8
To other offices?	29*	18†
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	52	37

The arrival of the Commission of Inquiry in Canada put an end to all further prospect of grievances, and appears at the same time to have damped the hopes and awakened the anger of the disaffected. The very act of investigating the complaints which they themselves had preferred was made a subject for

* Having held in all 35 offices † Having held in all 22 offices.

invective, the commission was denounced as an insult to the Assembly, whose voice alone, it was said, should be heard, and whose decisions were neither to be questioned by the Council nor the government. Knowing that every change would be effected which they had desired, "and that by their own showing they would be compelled to be tranquil, they promptly changed their ground, abandoned the untenable local topics, and boldly attacked the constitution. The mask was now thrown off, and republicanism openly avowed as their object." That this development was prematurely hastened by the unexpected and immediate concession of their requests, and their object disclosed sooner than they had intended, is evident from their address to the Governor, so lately as in 1831, whom it was their interest and intention to deceive. Early in that year they said to him, "It will be our earnest desire that harmony may prevail among the several branches of the legislature, that full effect may be given to the constitution as established by law, and that it may be *transmitted unimpaired to posterity*." Now different language was held, and that there might be no mistake, Mr. Papi-neau said—

"The people of this province were now merely preparing themselves for a future state of political existence, which he trusted would be neither a monarchy nor an aristocracy. He hoped Providence had not in view for his country a feature so dark as that it should be the means of planting royalty in America, near a country so grand as the United States. He hoped, for the future, America would give republics to Europe." p. 248.

It was the object of the French party to obstruct the arrival of emigrants as much as possible, and, in order to effect this, they resorted to one of those measures so common in Canadian legislation, the passing of a bill, namely, the chief object of which is at variance with its preamble. An act was passed 6 W. IV, c. 13, which, under the specious pretence of creating a fund to defray the expense of medical assistance to sick emigrants, and of enabling indigent persons of that class to proceed to their destination, imposed a capitation tax, which affected emigrants to Upper as well as to Lower Canada, and its operation was so severe, that even an inhabitant of the former province returning home by the St. Lawrence was liable to this grievous impost. When every other topic was exhausted, Mr. Rodier, a member of the assembly, actually went so far as to charge the English with having introduced the cholera into the colony. Absurd as this charge was, it produced an effect among the simple minded and credulous peasantry.

Matters were now fast drawing to a crisis. The legislature

was assembled by the Governor, and addressed by him in a conciliatory speech, in which concessions numerous enough to have satisfied any other than this factious race were made. Among other things they were informed that the Governor had dismissed some of the executive councillors, with the intention of remedying the evils arising from a plurality of offices. This concession was, however, received in the same spirit as all the others. Warrants were also tendered to each branch of the legislature for their contingent expenses; but as these charges contained on the part of the House of Assembly, the salary of Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Viger, agents in England, not appointed in conjunction with the Council, but by simple resolutions of the house, such an appropriation without law as this was violently opposed; and the constitutional party, previously to the meeting of the legislature, presented a resolution to the Governor in which they declared it "unfounded in law, unsupported by parliamentary usage." But the usual result followed, and this point also was conceded to the Assembly. They were now called upon, in the customary manner, to provide for the support of the judges and the officers of government, the public chest containing at the time 130,000*l*. The house had no sooner retired from hearing this address, "than their speaker adopted his usual mode of inflaming his party by the most violent invectives against all the authorities, both at home and in the colony; charging the one with deceit and hypocrisy in their words, and the other with oppression and perulution in their deeds. In a short time he brought matters to that condition he had so long desired."

The house voted an address to his Majesty, in which they announced that they had postponed the consideration of the arrears, and were determined to refuse any future provision for the wants of the local administration, in order that they might be the better able to insist upon the changes which they required to be made. The utmost which they would concede was to offer a supply for six months, which period they allowed to the government to decide upon their demands. From this bill of supply they excluded the salaries of the councillors, of their assistant clerk, of one of the judges, also some usual incidental charges of the civil secretary's office, besides other important salaries. This produced exactly the results which the Assembly had calculated upon when passing it: the Legislative Council refused to agree to it. The confusion produced by this refusal of the supplies by the Assembly it is difficult to imagine; the author shall describe it in his own language:

"The province was far advanced in the fourth year since there had

been any appropriation of provincial funds to the use of government ; and although a sum, temporarily contributed from the British Treasury, had relieved the civil officers, so far as to give them one year's salary during that period, the third year was passing away, during which they had not the smallest fraction of their earnings in the service of the public. The distress and embarrassment which this state of circumstances inflicted on the functionaries of the province, whose private resources are generally very limited, were as humiliating as they were unmerited. Many were living on money borrowed at an exorbitant interest ; some could not but be reduced to the verge of ruin ; and to show that this suffering of individuals was not unattended with danger to the general welfare, it may be enough to remark, without painfully dwelling on private circumstances, that the judges of the country were amongst those who were left to provide for their subsistence as best they might, after three years' stoppage of their official incomes." p. 258.

The following were the demands which the Assembly required as the condition on which they would pass the supplies :

"First—That the Legislative Council should be elective. Second—That the Executive Council should be converted into a Ministry, responsible to the Assembly. Third—That the Tenures Act and Land Company's Act should be repealed. Fourth—That the Crown revenues should be surrendered unconditionally. Fifth—That the management of the waste lands should be given up to them."

As the Assembly had separated with a declaration that they would never vote a civil list until these most outrageous demands were granted, it became absolutely necessary for Parliament to interfere, and Lord J. Russell proposed certain resolutions, which were carried accordingly. But although the right to interfere was with so much justice and propriety assented to by Parliament, yet there was so strong a disinclination manifested to exercise this power, that the Governor was desired to call the Assembly together again, in order to give them another opportunity of re-considering their former conduct. They met accordingly, but again refused all the supplies, which had now been withheld for five years.

"There was now no power to make new laws, no means of paying those who administered the existing ones, no appropriation for the public service in any department ; schools were neglected, roads unrepaired, bridges dilapidated, jails unprovided for, temporary laws expired or expiring, and confusion and disorganization everywhere ; and yet we are gravely told Parliament ought not to have interfered ! that it was one of the dearest and most sacred rights of the colonists to produce this extraordinary state of things, and that they ought not to be interrupted in the enjoyment of what had cost them so much time and trouble to bring about !" p. 305.

Some of the observations of our author upon the Canadian

revolt are particularly excellent, and demonstrate, in striking colours the effects which are sure to result from those principles which it is the object of a certain party in this country to advocate on every occasion.

“The history of this Canadian revolt is filled with instruction to the people of England. It teaches them the just value of the patriotism of those who are the intemperate advocates of extreme opinions ; it shows that courage in debate may sometimes evaporate in the field ; and that those who lead others rashly into danger, are not unfrequently the first to desert them basely in the hour of need. It exhibits in bold relief the disastrous effects of incessant agitation, and demonstrates that the natural result of continued concession to popular clamour is to gradually weaken the powers of government, until society resolves itself into its original elements. These truths are too distinctly marked to require to be retouched. He who runs may read, but he that would carry away the moral must pause and consider. It is written in the blood and suffering of the colonists, and prudence suggested the propriety of their availing themselves of the painful experience of others, instead of purchasing it by the severe and powerful process of personal experience. The successful advocacy here of similar opinions must necessarily produce the like results, aggravated by the increased power of numbers, and the greater value of the plunder. I have seen enough of England to admire it ; of its institutions to respect it ; of the character of its people to love it ; and of the blessings conferred by its limited monarchy, to know how to estimate the enviable lot of those who have the good fortune to inhabit it.

“ ‘ O fortunatos nimium ! sua si bona norint. ’ ”

And what is the conclusion to which we are led by a calm consideration of the facts and arguments which the author of the *Bubbles of Canada* has stated ? It is this. That Canada, ever since its conquest and annexation to the British Crown, has been governed on a wrong and mistaken principle, one utterly contrary to what experience ought to have taught, and although adopted in a spirit of generosity, in reality unkind not only to the subjects of the mother country, but even to the conquered themselves. This principle has been concession—unbounded, unlimited concession, into which may be resolved all the errors of policy which have been committed by successive administrations with regard to this colony. It was concession which led to the division of the Upper from the Lower province of Canada, in order to gratify the French portion of the inhabitants. It was through the operation of the same principle that the French code of laws was introduced again into the colony, although, by so doing, those promises were broken upon the faith of which British subjects had been induced to settle in it. It was concession which permitted the French language

to be used in the courts of law and in the legislature, thus substituting the language of the conquered for that of the conquerors, a practice entirely without precedent. It was concession again, or something, we fear, worse, which, has withheld from the clergy of the Church of England in Canada for so long a time, those lawful rights and possessions which had been secured to them by the Constitutional Act of the Canadas. It was concession, in short, which originated all the various blunders and mismanagement which have been so obvious to every calm and dispassionate observer in the conduct of the English towards the French Canadians. And let it be remembered, moreover, that these various acts of concession have not been made towards those classes who were distinguished by intelligence, affluence, and social importance, but, on the contrary, towards a part of the population buried in voluntary ignorance, contributing scarcely at all to the wealth and commerce of the colony, and which, instead of becoming more grateful to its benefactors, has exhibited towards them, as the result of each concession, an increasing feeling of dislike and enmity. In short, the interests of the English settlers have been almost invariably sacrificed in order to indulge the feelings and prejudices of a turbulent and factious race of aliens, who have actually become discontented, merely because they possessed every thing which they could have desired or wished for, and which, under their native rulers, they would never even have dreamed of acquiring.

Just as we had concluded this article we received the *Narrative of Sir F. B. Head*, and we could have wished to devote a considerable space to its very interesting contents ; but we are compelled by the lateness of its arrival to notice it much too briefly for its merits. Few authors besides Sir F. Head, we believe, could have contrived to render a volume almost filled with official documents so lively and entertaining. He appears to have done for Upper Canada what the author of the *Bubbles of Canada* has done for the Lower province, and has traced the difficulties connected with it to the same fatal principle of concession.

“Where, it will be asked,” observes Sir F. Head, in a memorandum on the political state of the Canadas, addressed to Lord Glenelg, “does the blame rest ? I respectfully reply, neither upon the surface of the country, nor upon the morals of its people ; but upon the *conciliatory* measures which, under successive administrations, have been unremittingly applied by the colonial office. If in common law respectable evidence be deemed sufficient to substantiate any accusation, surely in politics concurrent opinions, such as the following, ought not to be rejected :—

"First—The British population of Lower Canada deeply lament the course of policy which the Home Government, for many years, has been pursuing. Second—So does the loyal British population of Upper Canada. Third—the Chief Justice, the law officers of the crown, every faithful public servant in this province, silently evince their sorrow at the concessions which have been made, and which are still being made, to those few designing men who, for self-interested objects, have been long labouring to subvert the British constitution. Fourth—So do I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the province. Fifth—So does Sir John Colborne, the commander of the forces in Canada. Sixth—So do the British troops, who, although, generally speaking, regardless of politics, cannot here avert their minds from circumstances which are so glaringly before them, and which they foresee tend to haul down the colours that from boyhood they they have been taught to venerate."

It would appear from the statements of Sir F. Head, that the discontented of the inhabitants of Upper Canada have always been heard with too much readiness, and their complaints treated with too much attention by the official authorities. For proofs of this, we refer our readers to the "Narrative" itself, which is well worth perusal by every person who is at all interested in the condition of the colonies. We cannot take our leave of this work without again regretting the very limited notice which we are compelled to give of its contents, nor without expressing our sense of the thorough English tone of feeling and spirit with which it is drawn up.

ART. VIII. *Proposals for the Creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of additional Churches in the Metropolis.* By C. J. LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. B. Fellowes, London.

GREAT has been the call for Church Accommodation, and, comparatively speaking, small has been the answer. A few private persons, to their honour be it said, have munificently erected and endowed churches, and some of our prelates have raised funds, through the bounty of individuals, with a view of supplying the spiritual wants of the people. These funds are small, and by no means adequate to the demand. But what has the government of the country done towards this great object? While its members have occupied their thoughts upon foreign policy, or upon subjects of comparatively slight importance, they have neglected to provide churches for the vast increase of population; and thus Dissent and Romanism have prevailed in a country which, in good old days, was characterised for its unity and con-

cord, and, above all, for its Protestantism. Mass-houses and other buildings of schism have been erected upon the very ground which should have contained the lofty spire or the embattled tower, and a Pseudo-liberal government has countenanced the proceedings, and under the hollow and deceitful plea of satisfying the tender consciences of the Dissenters, has permitted their unauthorised ministers to violate our divine institutions, which Jehovah in his richest mercy gave to his people. Truly may it be said, that while we slept the enemy has sown tares. Had we been active, Dissent never would have prevailed. Had we been true to ourselves, Dissenting houses never would have been built. The activity and want of liberality of the members of the Church of England cannot be better ascertained than by the fact, that the Bishop of London cannot raise, in the most opulent city in the world, funds for building *fifty* new churches, while the Wesleyans have raised nearly *one hundred and eighty thousand pounds** for the purpose of upholding their peculiar doctrines, and the Roman Catholics *one hundred thousand pounds* for a building which is to surpass in grandeur and magnificence the noble cathedral of St. Paul's! It is reported that ten members of the Legislature have subscribed *one thousand pounds* each towards this undertaking. These facts render the indefatigable exertions of Churchmen absolutely necessary to preserve our Protestant altars, and to supply the spiritual wants of the people. It is now *fashionable* to be religious; and if the people cannot procure that religion which should be propagated by the Establishment, they will necessarily embrace the tenets of Dissent. People who have not entered so deeply into the subject as ourselves maintain that there is no increase of Dissent. When we speak of Dissent we include Romanism; but we hold it as an opinion which has not been formed at the heat of the moment, that unless the members of the Church of England become more active, our country, before this century be expired will be under the iron yoke of the Pope. Dissent and Romanism have joined hand in hand to root up the strong-holds of Protestantism, and while they are zealous and indefatigable in their object, we are supine. Let but the majority of our inhabitants, as in Ireland, become proselytes to the Roman Catholic faith, and England,

* The centenary fund, as officially reported to us from Manchester, now exceeds 167,000*l.* As this amount, however, does not include the sums raised at the Irish meetings, regarding which, our most sanguine expectations promise to be more than realized, we have great pleasure in informing our readers that the grand total at present is nearly 175,000*l.* The Dublin meeting alone produced upwards of 5,000*l.* and that of Belfast 2,600*l.*—*The Watchman.*

as a Protestant nation, will for a time be no more—an Egyptian darkness will cover our land, which it will require an interference of Divine Providence to remove. Let not our readers consider us *alarmists*; we do confess that we are alarmed for our altars—we do confess that we are alarmed at the progress of Dissent, and especially at the advances of Romanism. We have before had occasion to mention the fact of no less than *six hundred* Roman Catholic chapels, including stations, having been built in England during the last forty years; many more are either in progress towards completion or in contemplation, and now the following, from the *Roman Catholic Magazine*, is pressed upon our notice. “James Wheble, Esq., of Woodley Lodge, late sheriff of Berkshire, in a letter to the Editor of the *Reading Mercury*, reckons the number of *conversions* to the (Roman) Catholic faith in England to be about *two thousand* annually. Within the last few months, Dr. Walsh, bishop of the midland district, has confirmed *eight hundred and ninety-two* converts in the eastern counties. Among other converts, Frederick Lucas, Esq., of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, has abjured the tenets of the Society of Friends, and embraced the Catholic faith. No stronger proof of the spread of Romanism can be given. And what have been our exertions to oppose this spreading? On the part of the government encouragement has been given to Popery, as the fullest evidence will testify. On the part of the generality of the people, there has been an inactivity worthy of the severest censure. What then must be the inevitable result? *We* do not *convert* two thousand Roman Catholics annually, or a tenth of that number—it is well if one dozen Roman Catholics are induced to embrace the Protestant faith in a year. We might then have some hope; but we are not sanguine enough to believe that this is the case. Our population daily and hourly increases around us, and little or no provision is made for its spiritual demand on the part of the Establishment, while houses of Dissent are raised to receive the sheep which we have suffered to wander from the true fold, and exposed to the horrible darkness of unrelenting slavery and superstition.

In this article we wish, in the first place, especially to direct our readers' attention to the great want of church room in England, and, secondly, to propose some means to supply the deficiency.

The following tabular statements, which have given us much labour, will probably astonish many of our readers. We will first take a few of the London parishes, although sufficient to show the vast disproportion between the number of inhabitants and the church accommodation.

LONDON PARISHES.

Names.	Inhabitants.	Churches.	Church Accommodation.	Without Accommodation.
St. Andrew, Holborn.	5,570	2	2,840	2,730
St. Botolph, without Bishopsgate.	10,259	2	2,569	7,690
St. Botolph, Aldgate	9,615	1	1,024	8,591
St. Bride	6,840	2	3,240	3,600
St. George in the East	38,505	3	3,800	34,705
St. George the Martyr	27,334	2	2,560	24,774
St. George, Bloomsbury	16,475	1	1,800	14,675
St. Giles	36,432	3	4,500	31,932
St. Sepulchre	7,710	1	1,200	6,512
St. Stephen, Coleman-Street	4,014	1	890	3,124

METROPOLITAN PARISHES.

St. Anne, Soho	15,600	1	1,800	13,800
St. Clement	11,578	1	1,760	9,818
St. George, Hanover Square	58,209	4	6,700	51,408
St. James, Piccadilly	37,053	4	7,800	21,156
St. Martin-in-the-Fields	23,732	3	4,500	19,232
St. Paul, Covent Garden	5,203	1	1,300	3,903
St. Mary-le-bone	122,206	13	16,500	105,706
Southwark,				
Christ Church	13,705	2	3,400	10,305
St. George	39,769	2	3,640	36,129
St. Saviour	18,006	2	2,800	15,206
Lambeth	87,856	8	14,000	73,856

METROPOLITAN VILLAGES.

Clerkenwell	47,634	4	6,400	41,234
Fulham	17,539	6	8,400	9,139
Hackney	31,047	4	7,042	24,005
Islington	37,316	5	6,990	30,326
Newington	44,526	3	6,800	37,226
St. Pancras	103,548	6	8,780	94,768

PROVINCIAL TOWNS.

Names.	Inhabitants.	Churches.	Church accommodation.	Without accommodation.
Bath	38,063	7	10,000	28,063
Birmingham	138,252	10	14,500	123,752
Bristol	103,886	24	25,000	78,886
Carlisle	20,006	4	3,520	16,486
Coventry	27,070	4	3,050	24,020
Chichester				
Durham	10,135	6	5,840	4,295
Ely	6,189	2	1,500	4,689
Halifax	109,899	4	5,240	104,659
Huddersfield	31,041	4	4,920	26,121
Kingston-upon-Hull	36,293	4	4,240	32,053
Leeds	123,393	9	10,020	113,373
Liverpool	165,175	21	29,220	135,955
Manchester	270,961	18	21,600	249,361
Nottingham	50,680	5	5,400	45,280
Portsea	42,306	5	4,920	37,386
Reading	15,595	3	4,030	11,565
Sheffield	91,692	6	5,980	85,712
Wolverhampton	48,184	4	5,204	42,980

By these tabular statements the lamentable deficiency of church accommodation will at once be seen; and if it be the duty, which we maintain it is, of the Government to uphold the established religion of the country, it will be seen how deficient our Government has been in providing places of worship for the propagation of the Protestant faith. Several schemes have been proposed to enlarge the borders of our Church, but not one sufficiently satisfactory for us to recommend to public notice. Lord John Russell's *Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill* we consider to be founded upon the most unjust and tyrannical principle. It will tend to shake the security of all property, and the serious compromise of ecclesiastical rights. The noble Lord attempts to deal with property which belongs strictly to the Church as if he acted upon the idea that Parliament gave the property, and Parliament has a right to *re-distribute* that property. But Lord John knows perfectly well, although he does not act upon his knowledge, that Parliament never did bestow the property to the Church, and that if it did, it has no more right to *re-distribute* that property than the legislature has to parcel out the noble estate at Woburn to the suffering poor of Bedford. Sir Robert H. Inglis, that fine and talented champion of the Church, has put the injustice of this bill in its clearest light:—

“Would it,” said he, in his place in Parliament, “be considered just—

liable that, for the sake of relieving the temporal destitution of St. Giles's, the noble Lord should levy contributions upon all the large neighbouring parishes? and, upon the same principle, he would ask whether, because the spiritual destitution pervaded the manufacturing districts, the *cathedral* property throughout the country should be alienated, not only without the *consent of those who held it, but without even the imputation of any crime*, or an allegation that any serious misappropriation had taken place? Were they, at all events, without the slightest proof of any such misappropriation, to be utterly deprived of the control of that property? He called this a *confiscation* of property, although the more courteous name of re-distribution had been applied to it."

Again—

"He never did deny the existence of a very large amount of spiritual destitution; but he did deny that they should take from the chapter of Durham to give to that of Exeter, or that they should take from Exeter to give to Chichester."

Again—

"For his part, he could see no distinction between the custos, minor canons, and vicars choral of Hereford on the one hand, and the corporation of London on the other. If they were prepared to take from the city of London a portion of its property, and allocate it to the uses of the corporation of Liverpool, then, and not till then, would he consider them at liberty to meddle with the property of the cathedral of Hereford. If they were agreed that they were at liberty to appropriate the dock-duties of Liverpool to the uses of the corporation of Bristol, then, and not till then, would he admit that they were at liberty to allocate the revenues of the chapter of Durham to the relief of any of the poorer districts in Wales."

When Sir Robert Peel spoke upon this bill, he said that he would not allow the property to be taken arbitrarily from any chapter, except for the purpose of applying it to purposes strictly spiritual; and he intimated that, as he had the assurance of that, he was ready to support the bill. The property might be applied to spiritual purposes, such as, for instance, the present Government scheme of National Education, which might be termed spiritual purposes; or a further grant to the College of Maynooth, which might also be called a spiritual purpose. But is this acting upon a just principle? Church property was bequeathed by private individuals, for persons in particular stations in the Church, and often as rewards for long service. But the object of the Church bills is to wrench this property from the lawful owners, to deprive the Establishment of its prizes, and thus to decrease the inducement which has hitherto been held out to men of talent to enter the Church.

The Morning Herald has anticipated many of our thoughts

and arguments upon this subject, in so powerful and eloquent a manner, that we cannot resist quoting the article upon this subject which appeared on the 28th of February last:—

“The property whose title-deeds may be cancelled by the pen of a Secretary of State, or dissolved by the breath of a parliamentary division, is very like no property at all. This is just the position in which Lord John Russell’s bill of ecclesiastical duties and revenues places Church property, by the precedent which it goes to establish with regard to cathedral establishments.

“It must be admitted that a title to an estate dependent upon the capricious vote of a popular assembly is such a title as would hardly be called a “good title” in any court of law or equity—a title upon which no man in his reasonable senses would like to hold ‘his house, or his wife, or his ox, or his ass, or anything that is *his*.’ Yet this is the sort of title, and the only sort of title, by which the Church can be said to hold its property, should Lord John Russell’s bill of cathedral spoliation pass.

“What Minister of the Crown would dare to propose the cutting down of cotton-factories in the way, that the Secretary for the Home Department proposes to cut down cathedrals? Any attempt of the sort would raise an outcry about his ears, respecting the rights of capital, which would drive him either from his place or purpose. The very men who support and cheer him on in obtaining a parliamentary sanction to Church spoliation are the very men, who would urge the inviolability of factory property against the alleged ‘omnipotence of Parliament.’ And with reason—the *power* to take, with whatever solemn formalities it may clothe itself, if not accompanied by the *right* to take, is an unjust invasion of property, which it becomes all honest men to oppose, because of its injustice; and all wise men to resist, because of its consequences.

“Is the property which the Church inherits from pious donors, much of which property was bequeathed to particular descriptions of persons in the Church, and for specified purposes, less inviolable than that which a private individual may derive by will or by descent, or a fortunate capitalist may have screwed out of the labour of the poor? If so, it can only be that because it is dedicated to religious uses it is less sacred than any other property—a strange doctrine for a Christian people to hold—a strange doctrine for a Christian legislature to act upon.

“No—the reason why Church property is, in practice, less protected against the hand of power than any other, is not because its title to inviolability is less strong in the eye of reason and justice than property in secular hands, but because its possessors are weaker than other proprietors in the great council of the nation. Hence, as we said yesterday, when a system of confiscation begins in any country the Church is always the *first* sufferer—though *not* always the last.

“Many of those great proprietors who, from cowardice, or a worse motive, joined with the democrats of the French revolution in stripping

the Established Church of that country of its property for the 'public good,' and turning its clergy out naked and penniless upon the world, became themselves the beggared, wretched, out-cast victims of the rapacious precedent which they helped to make. In striking at the security of ecclesiastical property they blindly struck at the *principle* of proprietary right, and loosened the foundations of all property. Their punishment and their instruction came together. The lash of retributive justice opened their eyes, when the evil was irremediable, to a perception of their folly. Their example and their fate should be a warning to the lay owners of property in every country to avoid teaching the people lessons of confiscation, though intending, in the simplicity of their injustice, that *ecclesiastics* should be the only sufferers.

"How many cruel laws, how many laws of inordinate and terrible severity, did Parliament pass during the last century under the false notion of protecting property against petty depredation? What law is there to punish a legislature which itself violates the principles of morality, and sets the people examples of injustice? A higher 'OMNIPOTENCE' than that of Parliament so conducts the moral government of the world as to cause injustice, whether in princes or parliaments, or whole people, to work its own punishment one way or other.

"They who are the most ready to remove the landmarks of Church property are most generally people of that exceedingly 'liberal' temperament who would go any length to punish those who dare to remove their own. And, most assuredly, if Lord John Russell's bill should pass both Houses of Parliament, which we can hardly anticipate, the landmarks of Church property, as far, at least, as the rights of deans and chapters are concerned, will have been so arbitrarily removed that no act of confiscating legislation will, thereafter, appear strange or unprecedented.

"Let us suppose Parliament laying its hands upon the endowments of any Dissenting sect, and re-distributing or confiscating them as it is proposed by the ministerial bill to do with cathedral property, what an outcry there would be, and what accusations of monstrous tyranny and injustice would be brought against the Government and Legislature, and with good cause. The state, in which resides supreme power, should give the people the highest example of unblemished justice. 'All persons,' says a great authority, 'possessing any portion of power, ought to be strongly and awfully impressed with the idea that they act in trust, and that they are to account for their conduct to one great Master, Author, and Founder of society.'

"One act of injustice is ever the forerunner of some other. It is not only the prelude but the excuse of further wrong. This was well illustrated by Sir Robert H. Inglis, in his speech on the project for the 're-distributive confiscation' of cathedral property. 'Whenever,' he said, 'the state, or rather the power of the Government, had interfered with the Church, it had proved detrimental to the Church. The Crown, for instance, had taken away the broad lands of the chapters, and compelled them to take tithes, and it was rather too hard when the Government had created an evil to turn round upon those to whom it

had done the wrong, and oblige them to surrender their claim to that very property which had been given in place of those broad lands.' So it will be found that if the present attempted invasion of the rights of property belonging to deans and chapters be successful, the public advantage will be pleaded in defence of other acts of confiscating legislation, until the cathedrals, despoiled of all the revenues with which the piety of our ancestors had endowed them, cease to be any longer used as temples of Divine worship, and are abandoned to desecration and ruin.

"Milton, Republican and Dissenter as he was, would have mourned over the fall of those magnificent temples which ancient piety raised from its opulence to the honour of the Deity, and with the intention that they should resound with prayer and praise daily and many times a day, that so the public worship of the Most High might go on without a single day's interruption throughout all the ages of the world. Milton felt, as every man of genius must feel, the elevating and sublime emotions inspired by the solemn and majestic service of which he has expressed his enraptured admiration in immortal verse—verse, however, which will have no living application at a future day, if our 'liberal' rulers are allowed to commit the waste and havoc upon the cathedrals of which their present measure is but the bold and startling commencement.

"Even Sir Robert Peel, in supporting the ministerial measure, said, he 'regarded the cathedral establishments with the highest respect. He thought a loss of them, or any interference with their efficiency, would be a positive evil; viewed in connexion with the Monarchy, he believed it to be of importance that the wealth, station, and splendour of the Church should bear some proportion to the wealth, station, and splendour so easily acquired by other branches of the community in this great country.' Now we say that the ministerial bill is calculated seriously to interfere with the efficiency of those great religious establishments, which, if not supported on a scale of liberal expenditure in some degree commensurate with their grandeur, had better be closed altogether. But we take higher ground of resistance to the measure than this. We deny the *right* of Parliament to dispose of this property in the way intended, without the consent of the owners, though we by no means deny the *power*.

"The sentiment so well expressed by Sir Robert Peel as to the necessity that the Church, viewed in its connexion with the monarchy, should bear some proportion in wealth, station, and splendour to the wealth, station, and splendour so easily acquired by other branches of the community in this great country, was most eloquently and beautifully enlarged upon by Edmund Burke, when his inspired genius stood forth in all its majesty and power to stem the revolutionary philosophy of France, then exercising over the popular mind a dangerous fascination. 'The people of England,' said that great man, 'know how little influence the teachers of religion are likely to have with the wealthy and powerful of long standing, and how much less with the newly fortunate, if they appear in a manner no way assorted to

those with whom they must associate, and over whom they must even exercise, in some cases, something like an authority. Our provident constitution has taken care that those who are to instruct presumptuous ignorance, those who are to be censors over insolent vice, should neither incur their contempt, nor live upon their alms. For this reason, while we provide first for the poor, and with a parental solicitude, we have not relegated religion (like something we are ashamed to show) to obscure municipalities or rustic villages. No! We will have her raise her mitred front in courts and parliaments—we will have her mix throughout the whole mass of life, and blend with all the classes of society. The people of England will show to the haughty potentates of the world, and to their talking sophisters, that a free, a generous, an informed nation honours the high magistrates of its Church—that it will not suffer the insolence of wealth or titles, or any other species of proud pretension, to look down with scorn upon what they look up to with reverence; nor presume to trample on that acquired personal nobility which they intend shall always be, and which often is, the fruit, not the reward (for what can be the reward?), of learning, piety, and virtue.' The preferments annexed to cathedral establishments are some of those exalted provisions for learning, piety, and virtue upon which Burke would not have allowed either a minister or a mob to lay the hand of sordid economy or sacrilegious spoliation. But the bill which Lord John Russell has introduced to Parliament sweeps them away. Mr. Hume goes just a step further—that is, he takes the step now which 'liberal' legislation will take by and by, and says, 'Prebends should be put an end to, chapters should cease, and the funds hitherto at their disposal should be made applicable to the *purposes of national education, and the payment of the working clergy.*'

"In giving that advice the hon. member for Kilkenny exhibits a most generous disposition in dealing with other people's property. In this the great free-trader is not inclined, we imagine, to admit of any reciprocity, by allowing other persons the exercise of a similar liberality in disposing of his own."

Our great objection is to the principle of this bill, because it will establish a PRECEDENT of a dangerous tendency, not only to the security of Church property, but to property of every description. With like justice may all property be re-distributed or confiscated by the breath of a Parliament favourably inclined to spoliation. The point with us is not whether a Parliament can with justice apply Church property to secular purposes—we know that every man, with the least species of honesty, would at once give his unqualified disapprobation of such a proceeding; but it is whether a Legislature can apply property bequeathed by individuals, for especial purposes connected with the Church, to other purposes alike connected, such as, for instance, the present Government plan of national education, or, which would be more plausible, to *church extension*. We are prepared to

argue that they cannot, upon any principle approximating to justice and equity, especially as a precedent would be established which would endanger the whole property of the country. Let but this bill pass, and what becomes of all freehold security? What will prevent the Government from diminishing the *dividends of the Consols* to increase those of the *Reduced*? or lessening those of the *Reduced* to benefit the holders of *Bank Stock*? We maintain that the Legislature might rob, we can use no milder term, the holders of one stock to benefit the proprietors of another with equal justice. And what, we ask, is to prevent it, if the precedent be given? Yes, we maintain that if the precedent be established the Parliament might re-distribute the revenues of the two Archbishops for the benefit of the "inferior clergy," or for the purposes of a general education, including Romanism; or, as Mr. Joseph Hume would contend, for wiping off the national debt! We protest against the legality, the honesty, and the justice, of this bill; and in the name of JUSTICE and PUBLIC POLICY we invoke the landed aristocracy of the Upper House of Parliament, as they value the stability of their own ancestral possessions—as they venerate that constitution in Church and State, of which they have so often proved themselves the faithful guardians—and as they reverence the principle of RIGHT, consecrated in those laws of which their august House is the highest court of judicature in the realm, to *resist the bill of Cathedral-spoliation*, if it should ever come before them, as a measure opposed to justice, inconsistent with sound public policy, dangerous to the stability of the Church, and calculated to confound the notions of right and wrong, which are the foundations of public morality.

We hope our readers will not consider, that we have left our proposed subject, in order to give our decided protest against this bill now before Parliament; we have done so, because it has been intimated to us that some of the spoils will be handed over for the purpose of *church extension*. Anxious as we are to enlarge the borders of the Church, we should be grieved to see old institutions broken up and ancient endowments confiscated to effect this laudable object. If the Legislature intend to build more churches, especially in the metropolis, a duty, we hold, which belongs unto the government of a Christian country, some decided, but equitable, steps must at the same time immediately be taken to avert the rapid progress of Romanism.*

* We believe the present Government to be decidedly opposed to *church extension*. We have heard of a private individual making application to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests for an extension

The Bishop of London cannot raise a sufficient sum, as we have before stated, to build half the number of churches which are actually wanted; no, not even the number he had contemplated. The subscriptions from private individuals have been comparatively small; and as for the collections in the different parish churches, they have added but little to the amount already subscribed. One hundred pounds at the most had been collected in a parish church; but what is this sum, when sixty times as much is wanted to erect a chapel of ease or a district church? No positive or effectual good can be done to meet the demand but from the interference of Government. It remains, then, for us to ascertain what plan will be the most just, and consequently the most effective, to carry out this desirable object. It has been proposed to lay a small duty upon coals; to this we object, because it would be felt, at all events known, by the poor, who are necessarily compelled to purchase this commodity; and, however small the duty might be, even two-pence upon a sack, the increased expenditure would be felt. It is very well for those who have as many guineas in a week as a poor man has pence, to say that the tax, for it would be a tax, would not be felt; we have visited the huts of the poor, and enquired into their domestic affairs, and especially those of a pecuniary nature, and we can say with truth that the additional burden *would be felt*; and that that burden could not be avoided, because the tax would be put upon an indispensable commodity. If we are to have an extra duty, and this we conceive to be the only means to effect so grand an object, let the duty be placed upon spirituous liquors, and thus a very large revenue could be gained. Although the poor, and especially those in London, are the great consumers of spirituous liquors, still they are not absolutely necessary for their existence. And this duty might in a measure approach at times to a prohibition of these articles, and thus effect another desirable object. The numerous houses in the metropolis which, from their splendour and magnificence, go by the name of *palaces*, attest the vast consumption of these intoxicating liquors, and the large amount which would be gained annually for such an undertaking. In a very few years we should have a sum large enough to provide church accommodation for every inhabitant; we should have the bold steps of Romanism arrested, and we should have

of a lease of a house, and sufficient land to build a church, which would fall to the Crown at the expiration of seventy years; but that when they ascertained the object of the individual, a decided protest was at once entered against the proceeding!

the habits and the vices of the lower orders corrected and improved. These are no bold assertions, they are palpable truths; which only require the approbation of Parliament to throw into efficacy.

We do not believe, that this object can be adequately effected without a tax, and if this be true, it will be necessary to impose one, that will not touch the poor, and to take especial care that that tax be *small*. The poor should especially have the benefits of the Gospel without money and without price; provision should be made for their spiritual wants, without any inconvenience to themselves. It is useless to urge, that the poor would be happy to partake in so laudable an act; if so be, let them send in their mite to the metropolitan fund: but we conceive that great objections would be made by the majority of them, not so much on account of an unwillingness to promote the cause, as from an incompetency. The tax must be laid upon a commodity which cannot be felt by the poor, or only felt to improve their habits. Let it not, however, be thought, that we are advocates for new taxes; the necessity only induces us to urge the execution of some plan to meet the demand of the people, and to brave the threatenings of Popery. Legislative interference is now indispensable. And unless the Legislature does interfere, with a view of enlarging the borders of the Church, of increasing the happiness and prosperity of the country, and of propagating the doctrines, discipline, and order of the Establishment, without much political prophecy we do affirm that England, as a nation, will ere long cease to exist. The neighbouring nations are now threatening us: one after another is merging out of apparent nothingness and insignificance, and almost now bids defiance to our long boasted victories and triumphs. America is well nigh ripe for war; Russia is preparing herself for battle; and France, with her long buried jealousy, is ready to take advantage of our weakness. Providence, too, will direct the issue, and with righteous indignation may not the God of Heaven ask—"Did I not promise to visit for these things?" Oh! cold-hearted and spiritless nation, thou hast suffered Christianity to be corrupted! Thou hast been supine when thou shouldst have been active; thou hast been dead, when thou shouldst have been alive! I now will laugh at thy fear, I will smile at the consequences of thy iniquity. Go on now, and rest under the iron yoke of Popery: thy liberty is now enslaved—thy freedom is now captured; the iron yoke of tyranny shall bind thy dull neck, and victory to thee shall be no more!

Were we to regard the visitations of Heaven, we should invariably find them falling upon nations and cities that have been

regardless of Heaven's gifts. The Church at Laodicea is an example. Coldness and apathy were the crime: destruction was the visitation. England, too, among the nations must fall, if she continue careless amid the mercies of Heaven—if she suffer temples of Baal to take precedence of the temples of Christ.

We would urge upon the people to call loudly upon the Legislature for that which they have a right to demand—Church Extension. Deep and hollow as the cry may be to a government, hostile to the established faith, they must answer it by supplying the spiritual wants of the nation; and thus only will they save a people, hitherto blessed by the richest mercies and crowned with the highest prosperity, from the extreme visitation of Jehovah. They who have felt the benefits and advantages of a Gospel ministry should endeavour to extend those blessings to their careless brethren, and to supply them with that spiritual food that giveth life to them that have it. The work is great, but easy means can accomplish it. It is extensive, but a little labour can effect it. Have we no solitary member of either Houses of Parliament to form a plan to bring about so noble an achievement? Are we living in a Christian country, once favoured, on account of its loyalty to Jehovah, with the choicest marks of his divine favour, and have we no individual to propose an extension of church accommodation to be aided by a grant from the Legislature? Surely the members of the British Parliament, professing itself Christian, would not oppose any plan to promote so good a cause! The opposition might be made by the Romanists, upon the principle that it would be treason to their faith were they to omit entering their protest against any plan so likely to extinguish the corrupt doctrines of their Church. But would the plan be opposed by the majority? We say that it is not fair dealing to the nation to allow grants to Popish institutions and to withhold them from the Established Church of the country. Upon what principle of equity does the Government allow the grant to the College of Maynooth* annually, and withdraw that from an ancient society connected with the established religion? There is some trickery—some evident *design* to overthrow Protestantism, and on its ruins to plant the deeply dyed standard of Popery. We repeat it, that there is a design, which design should be exposed by those professing to revere the noble institutions which have been in time of need preserved by the very life-blood of our zealous ancestors. Only a legislative movement can give church accommodation adequate to the demand. And if the battle be not fought among those who have sworn to defend the Church of these realms, we must

* The grant to this Roman Catholic College was last year 8,928/.

continue to remain destitute of those means which have hitherto directed the inhabitants of this divinely-favoured nation from the temple of the Great Omnipotent made with hands, to that which is eternal as the Heavens.

ART. IX.—1. *A Glance at Public Affairs ; with a few Suggestions to the Conservatives of Great Britain.* By the Author of "Thoughts on the State and Prospects of Conservatism," &c. 8vo. pp 24. London : Mitchell.

2. *Political Prophecy fulfilled; or "Ireland" with a new Preface.* By GEORGE STEPHENS, Author of the Article on Church Rates, reprinted from the "Church of England Quarterly Review." Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 16. London : Mitchell.

THERE exists a wide and substantial difference between the clergy of a country who prostitute their high and sacred office before the altars of a blind and furious partizanship, and a clergy who calmly infuse into the public mind a pure and lofty tone of political integrity. No mortal can span the chasm that yawns between the two cases of a priesthood devoting all their energies to promote the return of members to Parliament, proposing them from the hustings, thundering forth their torrents of rough-cast eloquence from the altar, and wielding the horrors of the unseen world to induce their terrified hearers to vote for their nominee ; and of a clerical body discharging faithfully their scriptural and important duty as watchmen of our "holy and beautiful house," and, when impending danger threatens, proclaiming trumpet-tongued to the nation the portentous signs which herald the approaching storm. The political interference of the first rallies the basest passions of depraved humanity beneath the banner of a pseudo-religion ; the solemn and dignified warnings of the latter, enlist in the cause of true religion the noblest and most exalted feelings that can animate the human breast. Whatever is hostile to truth—whatever is subversive of morality—whatever tends to secularize religion and render it odious—whatever is turbulent and lawless—whatever inimical to comfort, order, peace, and security, is engendered by the former ; whatever is lovely and of good report—whatever teems with social happiness and national prosperity—whatever is calculated to purify and ennoble the heart of man, whether virtue, philanthropy, patriotism, or piety, is warmed, is sustained, nay more, is produced, by the latter.

Whatever is mean and despicable, whatever is brutish and satanic, emanates from the first and swells the train of its atten-

dant evils; whatever is great and laudable in man, whatever is honourable and patriotic, flows from the latter, and irrigates society with its wholesome waters. The first kindles deadly enmities and unchristian feuds under the mask of religion, the latter drains off the bitter dregs of religious animosity, and deposits in the congenial soil of the Christian heart the germs of an expansive, genuine charity. The one scatters firebrands and the elements of strife and discord among men, the other unites in one harmonious and unbroken phalanx the lovers of truth in defence of the altar and the throne. We have a full and palpable development of the former in the Romish priesthood of Ireland, and we ought to have an equally clear and broad development of the latter in the Protestant clergy of England. The time is not far distant, if it be not now, when *the existence* of our national Christianity and the stability of the throne will depend upon the exertions of our clergy.

We have been led to make these remarks because we are deeply sensible of the hollowness and fallacy of a widely spread notion, that clergymen should take no part in politics; that they should slumber on their watch-towers and peal forth no note of alarm, though the horizon be crowded with indications of a fast coming tempest; that they should permit their senses to be

“Drows’d with the fume of poppies,”

and be content to see the proudest institutions of the country levelled with the dust, and the ark of our Protestantism itself abandoned to the ruthless grasp of the Philistines, and stir neither hand nor voice to rescue the first from ruin or the latter from spoliation. Many appear to imagine that the rank and pernicious practices of the Irish priests are the necessary consequences of a priesthood attending to politics, and the same effects would naturally result from the interference of the clergy of the Church of England in political questions; whereas the truth is, that such enormities are the indigenous productions of a spurious creed—are peculiar to the genius of Popery, and can be justly attributed to no other parentage than the course of training received by the Irish priests in that hot-bed of sedition and immorality, the College of Maynooth: a college, to the eternal disgrace of England, alimented by annual grants from the public treasury!

We are not very careful ourselves to reply to the vapid and frivolous objections against the *Church of England Quarterly Review* on account of the political character of certain of its articles: but we anxiously desire to urge, in the most impressive manner, upon our valued clerical readers the urgent necessity for a manly resistance, in the spirit of calm sobriety,

to the torrent of infidelity, which is deluging the land. One of its most specious forms is an assumed sanctity, a pretended aversion to the connexion of religion with politics, for fear the chaste purity of the former should be tarnished by the contaminating touch of the latter : while, in reality, the aversion is to religion herself, and the real object of fear is, that the corruptions of political life, in which they delight, and by which they gain their own unhallowed ends, should be destroyed, and the base purposes of party be subverted, by her benign and sanctifying influences. Infidelity, deifying "*useful knowledge*," placing it on a level, if not giving it an elevation above, the Bible ; designating the peculiar doctrines of divine revelation as the "*opinions of certain theologians* ;" clothing herself in a robe of light ; simulating so extreme a veneration for religion that she does homage to everything bearing the name, and is equally ready to prostrate herself before the altar of superstition, of idolatry, or of rationalism ; this is the giant spirit of the age, which moulds alike in its palm the political nostrums of our senators, the jejune abortions of political Dissenters, and the ephemeral offspring of Whig reviewers and Radical pamphleteers.

Her waves rise and dash against the outward bulwarks of our Protestantism in vain ; their violence would root them more firmly upon the rock : but her subtle and corrosive poison is eating away the foundation ; she is stealthily and wilily suffusing the public mind with principles of irreligion and carelessness for the truth, under a mask of calm and intelligent inquiry ; sedulously instilling into the minds of her auditors that honesty of purpose is all that is requisite, and that the man who honestly believes in the existence of no God at all (if such there be) is as much on the high road to happiness, as the man who takes the Bible for his guide.

Popery does not oppose a barrier to this march of infidelity, but rather aids and abets it. And why ? Because she knows well that infidelity was never made for man : he *must* have some religion ; he cannot remain long without one ; and should infidelity succeed in sweeping away the National Church, her waters would soon be drained from the ruin and desolation she had made, and, like the waters of the Nile, leave behind them a putrid slime, in which would germinate and spring up the latent abominations of the Church of Rome, and yield a prolific but deadly harvest. There can be no disguising the fact that the Church of England could not be razed to the place without Popery occupying her place and rearing her dismal fabric upon her ruins.

Is it then a time for the Church to be silent ? Need her clergy any apology for lifting up their voice on high against un-

godliness in high places? If, when the sword was raised to strike Croesus to the earth, the danger of the father could unloose the dumb boy's tongue, shall we be silent—shall we permit our tongues to cleave to the roof of our mouth when it is more than a father,—when it is our country and our altars that are threatened? Perish the thought! Silence, under such circumstances, would be treachery to our country—it would be treason to our Queen—it would be dishonour to our God!

Let the clergy, then, not shrink from publicly declaring their opinions upon the political questions of the day; questions daily becoming more and more closely connected with the very vitals of our national Christianity. Let them not fail to exert their legitimate influence in support of the Christian institutions of the land. They possess an incalculable advantage over the generality of men, both from the superiority of their education and the sanctifying character of their employment. They are placed, too, on a high vantage ground—an elevation, from whence they may give a far more searching investigation, and form a far more impartial opinion of the merits and demerits of a question, than the parties who are borne irresistibly onwards, engulfed in the fury and the clamour of contending parties. This is one of the most highly distinguishing characteristics of the Church of England; a characteristic, bearing the impress of the Divine will; a characteristic to which no sect of voluntaries can lay the least shadow of a claim. The clergy of the Church of England, from their utter exemption from secular pursuits, are enabled to take a clear, a calm, and a dispassionate view of each phasis of the political world. The rapidly changing scene, which bears the million onward with the gust of a tornado, leaves the clergy in the tranquillity of their hallowed employments, and permits them to gaze calmly upon the rushing whirl of events, to decipher the impressure of the foot of Time, and all but lift the raven-wing of futurity by their clear perception of the currents of society, and the velocity or the tardity, with which they speed their varied course. The enlightening, dulcifying influence of the Gospel upon the hearts of its ordained preachers provides an unfailing rectifying alambic, through which may pass and be purified of their dross even the irritating subjects of political contention. The clergy need cringe to no one; they are thoroughly devoid of all temptation to sycophancy, or a servile adulation to the titled or the rich. Their authority, their sublime commission, is not received from man; and the breath of the rabble and the will of the opulent are both alike incapable of dissolving the hallowed ties that bind them to their charge. The shifting vane of popular caprice is the last object, to which the clergy of the

Church of England should direct their gaze: let them shape their course by the load-star of Revelation, by the revealed principles of eternal rectitude, with an inflexible integrity of purpose and unflinching singleness of heart, and they will effectuate great things for the Church, and achieve yet greater for the nation. Unmoved by the blandishments of the one party or the virulent hostility of the other, let them keep themselves aloof from the raging warfare; but, like the great Lawgiver who stood on the mountain-top with the rod of God in his hand, let them show unequivocally, that they are neither uninterested nor unemployed spectators of the struggle. The Church should neither suffer herself to be becalmed in the stagnant waters of popular apathy and indifference, nor yet permit herself to be borne headlong down the rapid torrent of popular frenzy. Steering clear of the quicksand, on which the apathist finds his bed of ruin, and the yawning vortex, in which the frantic bigot ends his precipitate career, and equally shunning the lavish and indiscreet expenditure of an impetuous and headstrong zeal, let her hoist her sail, not to the shifting breeze of popular applause, but to the pure and steady breath of heaven, and she shall be propelled triumphantly on her glorious course by the propitious gale of the Divine blessing.

The spirit of the age would induce us to think that religion consists in nothing but a cold and barren intellectual investigation of the evidences of Christianity and the wonders of creation, and is wholly inoperative upon the human heart; that it is a round of contemplative abstractions, an ascetic separation from the sympathies and the cares of human existence, and that it brings no machinery of moral power to bear upon the actions of a man, but that while it irradiates his intellect with knowledge, it leaves his heart unanimated by its mystic fires. It should be the assiduous care of the clergy to show that Christianity furnishes as undeviating a guide in the mazy paths of political economy, as she does in the less contested walks of ethical science; that while she enjoins the simple but majestic "FEAR GOD," she utters with an equal authority the command "HONOUR THE KING;" that she disciplines the children of humanity for every station, for the varied occupations of life without distinction; that the monarch on the throne, the statesman in the senate, and the beggar in the dungeon, are alike in need of her instructions and her guidance, her light and her control, that

"The Christian is the highest style of man;"

that if Christianity does nothing else, she at least has the power of remodelling, in a nobler and more elevated cast, the character of man, and by working every attribute and energy into a nicely

poised balance of subordination and dependence, prepares him for the exercise of a fervid but judicious zeal, an ardent fervour of devotion, a self-denying consecration of his faculties, in the service of his country and his God. But—

“*Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor,*”

is the confession or the complaint of some.

“I feel the imperative duty of bearing a faithful witness against the infidel dogmas of the day, let loose upon the country in the garb of political principles; dogmas pregnant with elementary evils, fraught with the germ of domestic misery and national decay. I ought to exert my influence, and expose the iniquity of the measures proposed by an unprincipled Government, whose continuance in the possession of the patronage and emoluments they love so well, can only be effected by the further demoralization of society and subversion of the Church; but if I meddle with politics, the finger of scorn will be lifted, and the tongue of the traducer will villify my character.”

Well, be it so. There is nothing to deter a man from his duty in this: the finger of scorn, under such circumstances, would be the finger of the thoughtless or the reprobate, and the approbation of a good conscience will prove an effectual panoply against the envenomed shafts of calumny. There is no mere personal consideration under heaven of more weight than the dust of the balance when national existence is at stake. The man of really majestic mind, and who exhibits the noblest instance of moral heroism, is the man who sinks the private individual in the patriot—who displays a pure and lofty zeal for the inviolate conservation of the British Constitution in all its integrity and essential purity, and with a dauntless spirit views each renewed attack as a fresh stimulant to his ardour, and as supplying new fuel to the quenchless flame of zeal with which he battles valiantly in defence of the Church.

No one can affirm that our present imbecile and grovelling Ministry do not daily furnish materials to keep patriotism alive in the British breast. If patriotism finds no congenial food in the labours of the Government, she is at least kept upon the alert; and—startled by the boldness of their follies and the extent of their enormities—she stands aghast and trembling at the spectacle of an Administration, with the destinies of Britain in its grasp, reeling like a drunkard on the verge of a precipice, careless of every thing but the enjoyment of the present hour, regardless of peril, steeped to the brain in dulness and infatuation, when warned of danger, hiccuping a blustering defiance, or stuttering a mouthful of incomprehensible inanities.

In taking a view of THE SESSION OF PARLIAMENT in 1839,

it may be well, primarily, to notice the changes effected in the Cabinet; changes which have been produced by a spirit of self-preservation, their mode of accomplishment dictated by shabbiness, the presiding genius of the Ministry—and the effects of which will be similar to those of every other of their measures—most disastrous to the empire. The Cabinet appears to enjoy equally a state of internal anarchy and imbecility; distinguished by no joint attribute but incapacity, united by no common bond of unity but their determination to *destroy the Church, ruin the country, and keep their places*. It is some consolation to discern evident tokens of decay in this paralyzing incubus; to observe how the Cabinet, like a rotten apple, is mouldering away, and will shortly drop into its original nothingness, to be remembered no more, but to be trod upon and loathed.

The Parliament met on the 5th of February; the Queen, in person, opening the Session; the Speech from the Throne containing nothing very remarkable, saving the assurance that “the reform and amendment of the municipal corporations of Ireland were essential to the interests of that part of her Majesty’s dominions,” and the two last paragraphs, which we give in full: the first being applicable to O’Connell and the Popish agitators of Ireland, equally with the Poor-Law agitators and Chartists of England, though intended only for the latter:

“I have observed with pain the persevering efforts which have been made in some parts of the country to excite my subjects to disobedience and resistance to the law, and to recommend dangerous and illegal practices. For the counteraction of all such designs I depend upon the efficacy of the law, which it will be my duty to enforce, upon the good sense and right disposition of my people, upon their attachment to the principles of justice, and their abhorrence of violence and disorder.

“I confidently commit all these great interests to your wisdom; and I implore Almighty God to assist and prosper your counsels.”

The beginning of the Session was characteristic of the Ministry. Parliament met on *Tuesday* the 5th; on *Friday* the 8th, Lord Glenelg announced to the House of Lords that he had resigned the *bustle* and *fatigues* of office. Alas, poor sleeper! Like the gods of Epicurus, there is no Elysium to thy mind like slumbering in the clouds. Bustle and fatigues! Unhappy shorer! Thy softly-cushioned ease is at length disturbed—thy long-drugged conscience is at length awakened, and alarm at thy portentous connection with criminality bursts upon thy soul! No. The case is far otherwise. Lord Glenelg, who to his many faults has not yet added that of deceit, gravely assures the House, that he was informed, *for the first time*, so late as the

previous *Tuesday morning* (the day on which Parliament assembled) that the Cabinet had *unanimously* determined on a new distribution of offices! The *unanimous* decision of the Cabinet doubtless puzzled the sleepy Lord considerably, and as he was a member of this very unanimous Cabinet, who pulled so well together, he might naturally be forgiven for a little curiosity to learn the particulars of the contemplated change, to which his colleagues had assured him he had given his assent, though his recollection entirely failed him, and he did not remember being consulted upon the subject, or the whisper of such a contemplation having reached his ears! He learns, to his astonishment and just indignation, that the Cabinet, who appear to have imbibed the very essence of shabbiness, having a design to sacrifice their defenceless colleague, for the purpose of re-appropriating his particular office, conceal their intention, proceed darkly to their work, and when her Majesty is actually on her way to the House of Lords to deliver the Speech for which the Colonial Secretary, as one of the Cabinet, was a party responsible, apprise him of his doom, and acquaint him that the colleagues who had concurred with him in preparing that Speech had separated their responsibility from his!

The Marquis of Normanby, having done all the mischief he could in Ireland, is inflicted upon our Colonies in the room of Lord Glenelg; and the Ministry appeared for some time at a standstill for want of a successor to the Lord-Lieutenancy of the sister isle. Report confidently asserts that five noblemen refused the proffered piece of patronage, unwilling to stoop to an office which had been desecrated and rendered odious by Lord Normanby's occupancy. We are inclined ourselves to believe that they found it difficult to meet with an individual who would bid high enough in enmity to the Church, in subserviency to Popery, and truckling to Daniel O'Connell! They, however, did succeed in finding such a man. A *man*? No—a creature. They succeeded in singling out one of the most lofty specimens of public virtue in existence—a man who irresistibly reminds us of

Cato stern, or Aristides just,
Or Cincinnatus nobly poor—

a titled creature, whose sole qualification for the important post he is selected to occupy exists in a virulent hostility to the Protestant Church, and a settled determination to weaken or destroy it. Yes, Lord Ebrington (the syllables of his name are enough to palsy the heart of the Irish Protestant) is entrusted with the government of Ireland! The dandified Lord Palmerston, with his *eau-de-cologne'd* protocols, and the ball-and-rout-

giving and jail-opening Lord Normanby, are puny babes in mischief-making to this Church-detesting Lord. Lord Ebrington has been known for many years as having rendered many little mean but most essential services to the Cabinet; a zealous Whig spaniel by whom many a gap has been stopped—many a wavering vote secured—many a forlorn hope led; and at length his faithfulness meets with its reward. After all, the Ministry seem to feel that the office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland has been disgraced, by their considering it fit for such a fag of faction as Lord Ebrington. We cordially sympathize with our Protestant brethren in Ireland, in the degrading, humiliating character of this appointment. What feelings but those of unmitigated horror, contempt, and alarm can possibly pass through the mind of a Protestant when he reads the following inflammatory harangue, and knows that the being who uttered such seditious sentiments is the Viceroy of Ireland?

“ House of Commons, July 20th, 1838.

(On the third reading of the Irish Tithe Bill.)

“ Lord Ebrington—‘ I am desirous of saying only a few words. I, for one, entirely concur in what was lately said by the noble Secretary of War (Lord Howick), that this Bill will be a mere adjournment of the question. I have ever considered the existence of a Church Establishment so utterly disproportioned to the wants of the people as that of Ireland a stain and a disgrace to the Protestant religion, and a great misfortune to the country. I should not be induced to support the bill if I thought its effect would be to prevent that reduction of the Irish Establishment which I believe will soon be extorted by the unanimous demands of the people. If I could see, in the present state of parties, any prospect of carrying into effect the principle of appropriation, no consideration whatever would lead me to listen to the question of a compromise. I shall vote for the bill, only because I expect that so far from preventing a thorough reform of the Irish Church, it will, by throwing the payment of tithes into the hands of those who have more power and influence than the present payers, render the war now waged against the Church more formidable. ”

The very first opportunity that occurred after this most disgraceful appointment was made known, Lord Lyndhurst asked the noble Premier whether, when he had recommended the appointment of Lord Ebrington to so responsible an office, he had been aware of the utterance of the atrocious sentiments we have just quoted by the noble Lord? Lord Melbourne always has an answer ready for such interrogatories as this, and he made use of it on the present occasion. His Lordship said “it was not orderly or regular to ask a question in that House having reference to what was supposed to have passed in debate in the other

House of Parliament." To which Lord Lyndhurst replied, "it was a matter of history; it had occurred in a former session." Viscount Melbourne then made a statement, as usual, "full of emptiness," a slippery vapid nonentity of a declaration, a perfect *Lord Grizzle's*: "Shall I tell you what I am going to say? I do not positively know; but, as near as I can guess, I cannot tell."

Lord Ebrington, having taken the oaths and his seat in the House of Lords, as Baron Fortescue, attempted an explanation of this speech, and a declaration of his intentions in the government of Ireland, on the evening of the 4th of March. With the fatuity generally attending wickedness, and the effort to mystify the public mind, he only made matters worse. His Lordship declared that "he had stated that the Protestant Church of Ireland was a stain and a disgrace to the country, and that he supported the bill because its effect would be to transfer the war from the weak to the strong, and that he hoped it would be carried on with effect against the Protestant Church."

Lord Lyndhurst and the Duke of Wellington were called up by this explanation, and in the most manly and judicious remarks demonstrated the danger to be apprehended from the appointment of a nobleman known to entertain the sentiments Lord Fortescue had just avowed. Lord Melbourne, with his customary careless and blind nonchalance, immediately found fault with Lord Lyndhurst for opening a debate upon the subject; Lord Lyndhurst was obliged to acquaint him that the discussion was on that occasion commenced by Baron Fortescue: so indifferent is the pampered poodle of a Premier to everything that passes beneath his nose, with the exception of the delicacies of a palace dinner.

While Lord Melbourne and his colleagues are declaring in Parliament that the newly dubbed Lord-Lieutenant entertains feelings of attachment to the Church, notwithstanding his former delinquencies, and Lord Fortescue himself is breathing out to the House of Peers what he imagines to be a consoling opiate to drug their jealous vigilance, assuring them that he intends to take the example of his immediate predecessor for his guide—(alas, for Ireland if he does!)—the leading ministerial prints republish the seditious speech we have already given to our readers, and make it the ground of a compliment to the Premier, declaring, in the strongest and most unequivocal terms, that Lord Ebrington's hostility to the Protestant Church of Ireland was the best possible qualification for the office of Lord-Lieutenant.

Parliament was never assembled to consider more weighty

matters than in the present session. The State, in all its relations, never was in such a lamentable, such a threatened, such a distracted, such a sinking condition ! Our colonies up in arms ; our home population in a state of unnatural fermentation ; Ireland on the brink of an eruption ; war all but certain with the United States ; bodies of men, calling themselves "*Chartists*," exercising with fire-arms, going through battalion drill, sending up delegates to what they were pleased to designate "the National Convention," and placarding the walls with the ominous words "*the coming Revolution*." Our wretched Ministry had postponed the meeting of Parliament to the latest period to which they dared to prolong the recess. The palaces of our kings, in the meantime, were converted into eating-houses for an indolent voluptuary and his train of parasitic myrmidons. Lord Durham had returned home from the Commander-Generalship of the Canadas ; and the puerile Ministry, with a littleness of mind and an effeminacy of jealous silliness consistent with their own peculiar paltry meanness, had the acceptance of his resignation conveyed to his Lordship on board ship, that they might enjoy the satisfaction of having deprived him of the salute to which he would have been entitled had he landed as Commander-General.

Every one expected a deadly combat between the ex-Governor and Her Majesty's Ministers ; but they were disappointed : the fanfaronade and bluster of the Canadian *Lucius O'Trigger* ended in smoke. The ex-High Commissioner has at present only published a voluminous State paper, entitled *The Report on the Affairs of British North America, from the Earl of Durham, Her Majesty's High Commissioner, &c. &c. &c., presented by Her Majesty's command*." This lengthy document is replete with interest, and naturally divides itself into three parts :—first, a view of the state of Lower Canada ; second, a view of the state of Upper Canada ; third, the remedies which Lord Durham suggests for the evils and grievances he has pointed out in these views of the state of the Canadas. The appearance of a portion of this address in the *Times* newspaper before it had pleased Ministers to lay it before the House, occasioned a great deal of silly and useless expenditure of breath. Up to the time we write there has been no fair and full consideration of what is emphatically and appropriately called "Lord Durham's business." Lord Winchilsea, with a manliness and dignity that do him infinite credit and entitle him to the gratitude of the nation, no sooner arrived in town, than he gave notice of a motion for copies of papers relative to the appointment of Mr. Turton. Lord Melbourne said, that the papers moved for would not give the noble Lord the infor-

mation he desired, and he therefore would supply it himself, and state the course which he had individually taken. This Lord Melbourne accordingly did. Lord Durham, with an effrontery which must for ever consign him to the scorn and contempt of every British heart, vindicated the appointment—affirmed that neither Lord Melbourne nor any other Minister had anything to do with it—declared that under similar circumstances he would again make Mr. Turton his confidential legal adviser—and finished by threatening that if the motion was not withdrawn (Lord Winchilsea having already signified his intention of pressing the matter no further) he would press “an investigation into the case of every public man who had received an appointment under Government after having been convicted of adultery.” Was there ever such profligacy, such a wanton, gratuitous insult to the moral feeling of the country! Well might McNeile wind up his splendid speech at Freemason’s Hall with the following beautiful peroration:—

“If there be any men of uncompromising truth—if there be any men of incorruptible honesty—if there be any men of impartial justice—if there be any men of unfeigned purity of heart and untainted loveliness of manners—if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, all, all are on the side of our scriptural institutions, and their nurseries, our scriptural schools. While, on the other side, with the exception of a few idolaters of nature, and a few amateurs of statistics—how shall I describe them?—“*Quis demagogus, quis desertor, quis perjurius, quis latro, quis gladiator, quis sicarius, quis parricidi, quis testamentorum subjector, quis ganeo, quis nepos, quis adulter, inveniri potest,*” who is not avowedly opposed to our Constitution, and our Church, and our scriptural schools?”

One of the first acts of the Premier was to inform the House of Lords that Ministers had no confidence in Mr. O’Connell, though that individual had great confidence in them. This was considered a most profligate avowal, as Ministers had a few weeks before offered this being, *in whom they had* “no confidence,” a high judicial situation. We are inclined to think that Lord Melbourne spoke the truth. It is out of the nature of things for tools to have confidence in their employer; it is the employer who has confidence in his tools.

But let us turn from the ancient Houses of Parliament to their new-fangled rival, “the National Convention.” The National Conventionists appear to possess a Ministerial and an Opposition party as well as the Parliament assembling at St. Stephen’s. The one calling themselves “*physical force men,*” the other “*moral force men.*” We will let these worthies, who are rabid for legislation, tell their own tale and explain their own objects. At a meeting held at the usual rendezvous for the riffraff and

dregs of the lower orders, White Conduit House, after some plainly clothed truths had been uttered by previous select orators, Mr. Feargus O'Connor closed the whole in the following soothing and impressive strain :—

“ The change they required was a political one, and nothing else. It was worth getting, it was worth living for, and it ~~was~~ worth dying for. (*Immense cheers.*) Where was the maiden Queen?—where the imbecile Ministry?—where the little Leader of the House of Commons?—or where the Tail that belonged to all: that should dare arrest the progress of an indignant people? (*Immense cheers.*) They would have, they must have, universal suffrage, and he had sworn to himself that he would have it, or die in the attempt. (*Tremendous cheers.*) They would have freedom, though they should fight for it. (*Immense cheering.*) He thought they had now placed themselves in a proper position; they had endured until endurance became a crime, and resistance to unconstitutional acts became a virtue. (*Cheers.*) After adverting to the Poor-law Act, and observing that the power of the ‘three devil kings’ of Somerset House was about to be renewed, he asked the meeting to say whether those devils should be resuscitated? (*Loud cries of ‘No.’*) Let them not say that if they were not determined. (*Tremendous cries of ‘We are! we are!’*) Suppose then, that on the morrow, the Convention, in the discharge of their sacred duty, were to be illegally arrested—for if they should be arrested it would be illegally—what would they (the meeting) do? (Here the whole meeting, which was about 2,000 in number, simultaneously shouted out, ‘We’d rise!’ This was succeeded by tremendous shouting, which lasted for several minutes.) ‘Now,’ said Mr. Feargus O’Connor, ‘I’ll stop; I am hard of hearing—let me hear it again.’ And again the assembly vociferated, ‘We’d rise, we’d rise; we’d fight;’ and again they cheered.”

The pusillanimous Cabinet, it appears, began mightily to dread and stand in bodily fear of this mock Patriot Parliament; and knowing, upon good authority, that in everything but numerical strength they were an equally formidable body with the Irish Agitator’s two millions of pike-men, seeing that the majority of them had reaped a prolific harvest of military experience under Sir De Lacy Evans in Spain; the little sombre Lordling, who

“ Would not if he could be gay,”

issued directions for an official communication to be made to one of the “spirited” delegates. The delegate, who happened to be a Newport magistrate of Lord John’s own creation, returned a spirited reply. The House of Commons asked for copies of this correspondence; Little John hesitated and looked sheepish. The Patriot Parliament asked their bold Robin Hood of a member for copies, which he produced immediately, and in due form “laid upon the table.” They were read amidst loud cheers; and the unanimous thanks of the “Patriot

Assembly" voted to Mr. Frost for "the spirited rebuke" he had inflicted upon Lord John.

The important question of National Education was one of the first to engross the attention of Parliament. On the first day of the Session (February 5) Lord John Russell gave notice that on that day week he would lay on the table of the House "certain papers relating to National Education." In making this promise, his *Frost*-bitten Lordship engaged to produce documents which at the time he spoke had no existence. On the 12th (the day specified) the little Home Secretary laid upon the table three papers, one of which only was dated prior to the day on which he gave the notice, one a day after, and the other *four* days after.

It is well known to our readers that Mr. Wyse, the present member for Waterford, has been indefatigable in his industrious labours to wrench education altogether from the Church, and place it in secular hands. Lord John Russell appears to be a convert to his flagitious scheme. His Lordship promulgated his plan (if plan it could be called) on Tuesday, the 12th of February. His plan is, like every other plan of the squeezable Administration, to do nothing themselves but to please the Papists, Infidels, and Liberals, by whom the Government is continued in existence, by holding out a probability that their conspiracy to wrest the education of the young from the hands of its natural superintendents may speedily be crowned with success. The plan is to do nothing for the present session, but to shift the labours of the Treasury in distributing the grants to a board composed of official persons and privy councillors. The appointment of Lord Lansdowne to be President of this board is hardly calculated to allay the fears of those who regard religion as the basis of all true education. We are not without our fears that this step will prove of more moment than the generality of men may be aware: that it will lead to the establishment of a mongrel, secular Central Board; and, if so, that it will tend materially to weaken the efficiency of the Church and promote the ends of Popery.

We are not a nong the number of those who regard knowledge as necessarily rendering a man "wise," or that by cramming the public mind with *Penny Magazines* you render it incapable of imbibing error. On the contrary, we hold that the spread of merely secular, that is, of *unsanctified* knowledge, has for its almost certain accompaniment infidelity; and instead of rendering the community impervious to her inroads, rather facilitates the encroachments of Popery, by first of all destroying in the human mind all perception of distinctions in religion, or, at least, leaving it a blank with respect to religious requirements,

and so paving the way for the reception of that creed most congenial to the depraved nature of man, and in the profession of which he can indulge unchecked in his sinful propensities, give the bridle to his lusts, and yet have his conscience quieted by an assurance of absolution.

In the meantime we derive encouragement from the noble meetings that have been held in various important districts, and the formation of a "Diocesan Board of Education according to the principles of the Church of England" in many of our dioceses. We sincerely trust that it may not be long before every diocese in England possesses such a board.

The existence of the Whig-Radical Cabinet notoriously depends upon the support of Irish Papists and English political Dissenters. The destruction of the ecclesiastical establishments is the equivalent they give for their retention of place and pay. No one can fairly accuse them of not toiling with unwearied assiduity and persevering zeal in the performance of this their official task. They cannot move without exhibiting their determination to overthrow those institutions. They cannot introduce a measure into the House of Commons without a broad development of their determination to legislate for the destruction of the Church, and the utter subversion of those principles of government, the preservation of which constitutes the stability of the throne and the greatness of our country. Having by low intrigue found their way to the helm of affairs, in defiance of the religious feeling of the most Protestant country in the world, they feel that their continuance in office depends upon the removal or annihilation of the religious sense which pervades the British community; and instead, therefore, of discharging the proper functions of a government, and giving a salutary direction to that religious sense, they incessantly strain every nerve to outrage that religious feeling, and to demoralize the public mind, and destroy its perception of the distinction between truth and error. We are bold to predict that they could not dissolve the Parliament without having an overwhelming majority of English members against them. Let them try the experiment; let them only dare to dissolve, and the outraged Protestant feeling of the English, instead of decimating, as at the last general election, will sweep away the already tottering ranks of the Papist-ridden Ministry, as the breath of the rude blast of Autumn scatters the sapless leaves of the forest. And what is more, we are equally certain that an Administration supplying the places of the present troop of drivellers and stultiloquent fribbles, if coming into power distinctly upon Protestant principles, would prove as solid and as permanent as the most fastidious patriot could desire.

It is morally impossible that a Ministry composed of such elements as the present Administration should enjoy the confidence of the British public. They never did possess it, and never will. The state of the country is ample evidence of the miserable inefficiency and baseness of the Cabinet. To use the eloquent language quoted in the able pamphlet which heads this article—

“If we see the people obedient to the laws, prosperous in their industry, united at home, and respected abroad, we may reasonably presume that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities, and virtue. If, on the contrary, we see a universal spirit of distrust and dissatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, dissensions in all parts of the empire, and a total loss of respect in the eyes of Foreign Powers; we may pronounce, without hesitation, that the government of that country is weak, distracted, and corrupt.”

Corrupt, distracted, weak, to a proverb, are our wretched, mean-spirited rulers. The state of the country proclaims it; the position of the Church proclaims it; the volcanic condition of Ireland proclaims it; bad men in power and dignity—the good and virtuous excluded from the presence of royalty and the honours of the State; the boldness of the traitor, the rapid and unchecked spread of sedition, the resuscitated potency and influence of Rome; all, all proclaim it in a voice of thunder to the nation. Every act of the unprincipled Cabinet bears indelibly inscribed upon its front “DESTRUCTION TO THE CHURCH.” Each speech of its worthless members teems with awful and unvarnished sentiments of hostility to our faith. How long are these harpies to be permitted to defile the benches where a Chatham and a Peel have thundered forth the torrents of their brilliant eloquence? How long to pollute the offices in which a Wellington and a Pitt have braced the sinews of the Commonwealth, and dazzled Europe with the wisdom and the power of British policy? When and how are these vultures to be unroosted? The war, on their part, is one of ruthless extermination, war to the knife, without parley or quarter, against the Constitution and the Church. Let the noble sentiment *vincit amor patriæ* nerve the heart of every Englishman, in contributing his quota of exertion to the noble, the constitutional effort, of hurling these charlatanical miscreants from the seats they have usurped and fouled. England, demands it; Europe, demands it; the interests of the world, demand it. More; posterity, demands it.

The basis of the throne is loosening, the cement of our noble constitution melting, our glory tarnishing, our energies decaying, paralysis and torpor seizing upon our vitals, our flag rolling in the dust, our arms despised, and the colossal fabric of our greatness mouldering into ashes. With the sweep of a tornado, the

breath of the Cabinet is laying waste the country, scattering desolation from the centre to the circumference of our empire; heaping ruin upon ruin, destruction upon destruction, piling trophy upon trophy of their ruffian sacrilege, at the shrine of their Popish Daniel. Every day they remain in office beholds Protestantism weakened, Popery strengthened; the interests of the Church assailed, the power of its opponents augmented.

Among other matters to which they have condescended to turn their august attention, besides dining with the Queen, and lolling with other quid-nuncs at Brookes's, is the defective state of prison discipline in England. A ministerial bill has accordingly been brought in, and printed, in which the cloven-foot is peculiarly apparent. The 14th clause in the New Prison's Discipline Bill for England runs thus :

"And be it enacted, that in every prison in which the average number of prisoners professing any one and the same religion, different from the Established Church, confined at one time during the three preceding years shall not have been less than 50, it shall be lawful for the justices, or other persons having the appointment of the chaplain of such prison, if they shall see fit, to appoint and remove at pleasure a teacher or clergyman, acting as such at the time of appointment in some chapel duly registered as a place of religious worship, of the religion of such prisoners, for the instruction and spiritual assistance of such prisoners solely, and for the persons having the controul of the funds applicable to the expences of such prison to fix the salary to be paid to such teacher or clergyman, and to make order for the payment thereof out of the funds applicable to those expenses."

A clause, similar to the above, was, our readers may recollect, introduced into the Ministerial New Prisons Bill of last session, by the "penetrating activity," as the Papists delighted to call it, of the Popish Mr. Langdale. The clause is now embodied in the bill itself, having been fondled and dandled into a more formidable shape by the fond Popish Ministry who have adopted it and kindly relieved its parent from all further trouble on its account.

The Ministry appear, indeed, very ready to stand wet nurse to any abortion of the Papists or Dissenters. And the Papists and Dissenters, in return for the condescension of Ministers, in permitting them to satiate their cormorant appetites with the milk of patronage, very kindly lend them their support, and retain them a little longer in the possession of their salary and place.

The clause with which we have just sullied our pages proves incontestably that the old war-cry of the Dissenters is abandoned; that they possess a new war-whoop, and have given their ancient watchword, "TOLERATION" to the winds. It appears that they no longer seek "*Toleration*" from the squeezable occupants of office,

but something more; *sanction, Government patronage, the appointment of their own teachers* to the discharge of *public duties as authorized clergymen*. In a word, that Popery, Socinianism, Socialism, and every other shade and form of Dissent, is to be established (if words mean anything) as the religion of the country. That truth and error are equally to receive the sanction and support of the Government; and all that is necessary to a "preacher of anything" being paid and sanctioned by the State, is the fact of there being fifty criminals in a gaol who hold the *same religious principles (!)* with him. The *religious sentiments criminals* is to be the guage by which to ascertain a man's fitness for the sacred office of a minister of the Gospel!

We have here the apparent anomaly of Voluntaryism and Popery opening their mouths in an unceasing clamour against, and abjuration of, State pay; and opening their rapacious jaws equally wide to catch the loaves and fishes an *un-English* and imbecile Ministry are besotted enough to scatter among them.

We could show too, from parliamentary papers, that with the consistent inconsistency which has attached to the practices of the "infallible" Church of Rome throughout every age of her history, while she is in the present day straining her lungs in England against Establishments, and with her hoarse tocsin cheering on the Dissenters in their unchristian warfare against Church property and endowments, she is, in the British dependencies, grasping with eager avidity every penny of the public money on which she can lay her hand.

We may just notice, before passing to another subject, that there is in this clause a striking exemplification of the "March-of-Mind Infidelity" of the present day. In the contemplated *pseudo-improvements* to be effected in Prison Discipline in England, the precedence is given to "teachers" and to "instruction," while "spiritual consolation" and "chaplains," as occupying a less important place in the estimation of Government, bring up the rear.

"Man must soar,"

wrote the immortal Young,

"An obstinate activity within,
An unsuppressive spring, will toss him up,
In spite of fortune's load."

The reverse is the case with our contemptible Ministry; they sink, they fall, their power dwindles, their scanty fame daily becomes

"Small by degrees and beautifully less."

But perhaps this is one of fortune's frolics, as their elevation

to the surface of society, in the first instance, evidently was. They were pitch-forked into public notice by a frolicsome toss of Fortune; every one devoid of the slightest pretensions to a just claim upon the respect and admiration of the public, and resting his little stock of popularity upon some fortuitous circumstance. The least stupid of the lot, Lord John Russell, serves as a sample of the whole. His congée to the public was first made in the shape of a literary achievement; a brace of wooing turtles, a twin pair of sucking doves, to which his starched and oozy brain gave birth; to wit—*A History* and *Don Carlos*:

“And up he rises like a vapour,
Supported high on wings of paper,
He singing flies and flying sings,”

and immediately becomes a great man—in his own estimation.

But Young tells us that even

“Slaves build their little Babylons of straw;”

These noble and patriotic men, however some may traduce them and set them down as the slaves of the Arch-agitator, are evidently primed to the full with “delicate moralities of sense,” and have long ago ceased to build their little Babylons, but are absorbed in the congenial and manly pursuit of playing at chuck-straw with the enemies of the State. High and dignified Statesmen! Illustrious Senators! Fit to rule an empire that could shake Europe with a nod!

But the hour already shadows the land when this unsupportable usurpation of place and mockery of dignity must cease. When the curtain shall roll down its voluminous folds and proclaim the farce at an end. Then shall we

“See the buskin’d chief
Unshod behind this momentary scene;
Reduced to his own stature, low or high,
As vice, or virtue, sinks him, or sublimes;
And laugh at this fantastic mummery;
This antic prelude of grotesque events,
Where dwarfs are often stilted, and betray
A littleness of soul by worlds o’er-run,
And nations laid in blood.”

How the Ministers will occupy themselves when out of office it is impossible to predict. We may, however, live to see a strange and eventful change come o’er the spirit of the scene. Lord Melbourne, unable to forego the pleasure of dining in the palace, and no longer invited there, may probably become court jester, and, with a cap and bells, discourse most eloquent music

and regale the ears of the royal dinner circle with the euphonious jogging of his head-piece, which has long been employed in a less innocent manner. His Lordship will then possibly remind the nation of

“ A Nero quitting his imperial throne,
And courting glory from the tinkling string.”

In sober seriousness, we do derive hope for our country when we look at the Ministry. They *cannot* ; it is impossible, if Englishmen still retain a British spirit, that such men *can* be permitted any longer to maladministrate the affairs of this country. Amidst all the black and dreary tempests with which they have darkened the hemisphere, the raging fury and elemental strife of the political world, we can quote the words of Virgil and believe them to be applicable—

—— Soles et aperta serena
Prospiceri et certis poteris cognoscere signis.”

We believe that the folly, the madness, the imbecility, and the unprincipled weakness of the Cabinet, have irretrievably paved the way for their exit from office.

But our limits warn us to be brief. We cannot, however, pass over without observation an outrage committed upon the service most warmly enshrined in the heart of every Briton, and to which we are eternally indebted. The proud flag of Britain has again been insulted. A short time will suffice to show whether with impunity. The Whig-Radical Cabinet having on a previous occasion shown their aptitude at self-degradation, and their readiness to submit to any indignity rather than maintain the honour and vindicate the integrity of our national independence ; a nation nearer home commits an outrage on our flag. Yes, a nation whose fleets have been annihilated by the valour of our navies, and whose proud eagles have been crushed to the dust by the prowess of our arms, offers the British nation an insult the most humiliating and intolerable that can possibly be inflicted upon a generous and a manly people. The Secretary of the Admiralty, in his customary manner, endeavoured, in his place in the House of Commons, to mystify the matter. The circumstances, as near as we can make out from the most authentic sources, are simply these :

The day of the attack on the castle of Ulloa, Vera Cruz, her Majesty's packet *Express*, Lieutenant Croke, R. N., was in the harbour ; but seeing the preparations by the French for the bombardment, a native pilot was induced to trust himself to the safety of the British flag, and pilot the gun-brig to the island of

Sacrificios. On his way thither, Lieutenant Croke, with the English colours flying, passed the corvette which Prince de Joinville commanded; mutual civilities being exchanged, as her Majesty's packet was proceeding, signals were seen flying at the French admiral's mast-head. A shot was presently fired by the corvette across the bow of the *Express* packet, an English jack was shown at the Frenchman's mast-head, and a boat was discerned pulling from him. Lieut. Croke hove to, and a French officer having boarded the packet, positively demanded the pilot. The packet being under the guns of the corvette, the commander, after some objection and remonstrance, felt compelled to surrender him, and he was forcibly taken on board the French ship. It should be borne in mind that the pilot had only embarked on board a neutral vessel, under the confidence which foreigners have reposed in the protection of the British flag. An English officer induced him to leave the safety of his home, and he felt that he was surely intrusting himself to the officer of a nation powerful enough to protect him. The poor man, however, with the ensign and pennant of England waving above his head, in vain intreated the rights of that confidence which had brought him, not to pilot an enemy against his country, but a neutral ship from danger. In vain he averred that, should he be forced to pilot the French to the action, his own indignant countrymen would reward his involuntary treachery with death. His just remonstrance was vain—for the first time the British flag was implored in vain—the red cross of Albion was dishonoured, humiliated, and powerless. The respect which, under Whig impotency, England ceases to maintain for her own glorious flag, availed not for the security of even the decent rights of neutrality. A British officer, beneath his own pennant, with the commission of the Queen and the uniform of his country, in her Majesty's armed brig, was compelled, by superior force, to resign his pilot a prisoner into the hands of the enemy—a prisoner to lead the foe to the attack and slaughter of his own countrymen! Comment on the outrageous insult would be superfluous. Every Englishman will feel not more indignant than ashamed. Shall we dare to resent it? Where is the force to command respect? It is mockery to complain—it is only one more insult; and, since the effeminate creatures that degrade our Government have held office, the flag of Britain has experienced more insult in three years, than she had previously brooked for three centuries. With such governors, it would be wiser at once to land our ship's guns, disarm our officers, and no longer offer the pretence of an armament to the bullying insult of the foreigner.

This matter is one of a most serious and disagreeable nature.

Where are the wooden walls of old England? Why do they not “ruffle their plumage, gather up their scattered elements of strength, and awake their dormant thunder?” They no where exist. Our Navy is a shadow; while Lord Melbourne frolics at the palace, and, with the air of a *Giovanni*, gaily chants:—

Posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo,

Our Navy, like every thing else connected with the dignity of the State, dwindles into nothingness.

Mella jubes Hyblæa tibi vel Hymettia nasci.

Et thyma Cecropiæ Corsica poscis api.

You might as well try to extract honey from a pebble, as hope for wisdom or prudence in any department of the State, while these wretched betrayers of their country are permitted to remain in office.

Public attention has, however, been awakened to the neglected state of the British Navy, and we hope it is not yet beyond the reach of remedy. The lamentable and defective condition into which our Navy has been permitted to sink, has called forth a crowd of pamphlets, all of which, with very few exceptions, agree in deprecating the defenceless position to which the first maritime nation in the world has been brought by the ill-omened harpies, who glut on the public purse. The supineness and money-scraping economy of these “no patronage” gentlemen must disgust the most charitable, and rouse the zeal of the coldest apathist. Had the tenth part of the vast sums lavished upon commissions, and poured profusely into the laps of needy adherents, to purchase an extra vote, or secure a vacillating member, been expended on the necessary repairs and equipment of our ships, there would have been no cause of complaint in the state of our Navy. As it is, it may prove only a temporary evil; we heartily wish it may, and we cordially join in the wish expressed in one of the most able pamphlets* we have yet seen upon the subject.

“We trust that the follies and delusions which for some years past have obscured our political atmosphere, and invested objects of very secondary importance with an unnatural magnitude, may speedily pass away, that our attention may revert with redoubled anxiety to those great sources of our power—our ships, our colonies, and our commerce—never again forgetting that if these are choked by our negligence, or diverted into other channels by the superior activity of our rivals, the broad and beautiful stream of national prosperity, which has hitherto irrigated and fertilized the remotest corners of the empire,

* *Observations on the Preparation and Discipline of the British Navy; with Suggestions for a better System.* 8vo. pp. 30. London. Dalton.

will soon be dried up and disappear, its rocky and arid bed alone remaining as a mournful memorial of our departed greatness."

The Navy, however, we lament to say, has fared the fate of everything essential to the greatness of the country; it has been sacrificed to the base purposes of party, and its important posts of responsibility filled with inexperienced hangers-on, whose attention is mainly turned to balls and the race-course, electioneering, and political jobbing. Spirits of departed heroes! Duncan, Rodney, Jervis, Nelson, Howe! Do ye witness our disgrace—our depth of degradation!

Captain Berkeley, a Lord of the Admiralty, who displays a knowledge and acquaintance of the subject, and an amount of professional ability and zeal for the service to which none of his opponents can lay the least shadow of pretension, openly declares himself the leader of the outcry against the inefficient state of the Navy, and immediately vacates his seat at the Admiralty Board. Sir John Barrow attempts to reply, but fails; and more than fails: renders himself ridiculous, and destroys his credit with the public for the future. Would any one believe it possible that one of the chief arguments by which Sir John Barrow endeavours to vindicate the criminal neglect of our Navy, is by striving to convince us that because some of our ships have been bravely and successfully fought, when short of complement, as at the Nile, we may therefore safely leave them so now? Is this madness? Or is it meant as a specimen of the affectionate solicitude of our rulers for the interests of the State? Is the person, who can write thus, fit to retain the important office he holds at the Admiralty? A few pregnant facts will exhibit the justice of the charge, that the Navy has been suffered gradually to sink; in short, that, virtually, WE HAVE NO NAVY.

In the two first years of Earl Grey's parsimonious but place-filling Administration, the Navy estimates were reduced first 900,000*l.* and then 300,000*l.* In the last eight years, only one ship of the line (the *Vanguard*) and three large frigates (the *Vernon*, *Pique*, and *Inconstant*,) have been launched. To show the total absence of all preparation, when the first intelligence of the revolt in Canada reached us, in December, 1837, we had *only one ship at home* (the *Inconstant* of 36 guns) manned and ready for sea; and we were actually obliged to send off to Spain and Portugal for others before we could despatch *even two regiments* to reinforce the garrison at Halifax. What is worse, with all this inefficiency, and with Russia crowding her seas with an effective, large, and well-trained fleet, there appears to be no arrangements whatever for rapidly fitting out a British squadron.

Under such gross and palpable mismanagement, our Navy, which was the best, will very soon become the worst, in Europe.

But what have Ministers done in the way of legislation since the first opening of Parliament? Nothing! What course are they about to adopt with respect to any of the great measures of the day? They are not yet determined; they do not know; but, as near as they can tell, they are not yet prepared to answer the question. Is a question put to any member of the Government on any matter connected with his particular office? He is not prepared to answer; or he knows nothing about it; he has not heard; he will make enquiries! All this is very satisfactory to the country, and highly creditable to the Ministers. A dozen costermongers would conduct matters better than this worthless Cabinet.

On the crying evils of Ireland we shall not say much. Those evils have been fearfully fomented by the present Administration. We will content ourselves with referring our readers to the pages of Mr. Stephen's very valuable pamphlet which heads, this Article, and which fully merits the title he has given it, as well as the most attentive perusal of our readers. We cannot, however, forbear most earnestly soliciting attention to a most seasonable and dignified public document, in the shape of an Address to Her Majesty, presented at a levee on the 6th of March by the Earl of Charleville, "from the Justices of the Peace of the King's County, Ireland, humbly setting forth the disturbed state of their districts, the causes which in their opinion have led to these outrages, and humbly imploring, as the most urgent of their duties, your MAJESTY'S protection for the peaceable and well affected inhabitants of that country."

We give the address entire. It breathes the language of the purest patriotism and philanthropy, in the calm and pregnant words of the most consummate wisdom. It is a strange thing to us that any Christian should doubt the only remedy for Irish evils: that men who have seen the achievements of the Gospel; who have seen the altars of superstition crumble into dust before the power of Divine truth, the temples of Satan purged of their idols, and consecrated to the worship of the one true God; who have seen civilization rise on the ruins of former barbarism, the weapons of war converted into implements of peace; the dark breast of the savage, once the throne of every malignant passion, become the abode of love and tenderness and joy; and comfort, order, and domestic peace supply the place of turbulence, strife, and remorseless cruelty, should doubt that the extensive circulation of the Bible and the extension of

sound scriptural education throughout Ireland would humanize her population, and save her yet from destruction.*

“ May it please your Majesty,

“ We, the magistrates of the King’s County, humbly pray permission to approach your Majesty, and most respectfully to tender the assurance of our devoted attachment to your Majesty’s crown and person.

“ Convened by the lieutenant of our county to consider of its condition under afflicting circumstances, and anxiously desiring to discharge the duties imposed upon us by your Majesty’s commission in a manner becoming the faithful servants of your Majesty, we feel that the most urgent of these duties is to implore for the peaceable and well-affected inhabitants of this unhappy country your Majesty’s gracious protection.

“ We venture humbly to assure your Majesty, that we would not dare to abuse the Royal mind by misrepresentations reflecting dishonour upon Ireland, and all who administer its government. We have no interest in the excitement of bad passions, or the agitation of the public mind. Our prosperity is in the repose of the country, and the tranquillity that flows from order and submission to the law. We are, one and all, impressed now, as we have ever been, with the paramount obligation of supporting with our hearts and means your Majesty’s executive authority, to whatever hands committed. To us there can be no gratification in the expression of our solemn conviction that the peaceable and well-disposed subjects of your Majesty have little security in Ireland for their possessions or their lives.

“ The latest evidence of this truth is the event we are assembled to investigate and deplore. It may be thought that the feelings which influence all men in the circumstances we have witnessed, have drawn us into conclusions which are too general, and that our representation of our condition is suggested by the fatal outrage upon the Earl of Norbury. We humbly pray your Majesty to believe that the convictions we have presumed to express have not been so formed. They are the experience of our

* We take this opportunity of expressing our cordial approval and sincere wishes for the prosperity of the “ CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY FOR IRELAND.” Indeed, under such patronage as the following, it cannot fail to be amply supported. We recommend it to the liberal support of our friends:—

Presidents:—His Grace the Lord Primate, the Lord Bishop of Meath, the Lord Bishop of Kildare, the Lord Bishop of Kilmore, the Lord Bishop of Clogher, the Lord Bishop of Elphin, the Lord Bishop of Ossory, &c., the Lord Bishop of Dromore, the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, the Lord Bishop of Cork and Ross, &c., the Lord Bishop of Limerick, &c.

Vice-Presidents:—The very Reverend the Deans of Armagh, Ardagh, Cashel, Clogher, Derry, Elphin, Emly, Kilmore, Limerick, Leighlin, Ossory, and St. Patrick’s; the venerable the Archdeacons of Armagh, Ardagh, Achonry, Cashel, Connor, Dublin, Derry, Down, Ferns, Kildare, Kilmore, Kilmacduagh, Leighlin, Limerick, Lismore, and Ossory.

life, the result of observations which none of us can avoid, and in which we all agree. We see in the destruction of a resident nobleman a proof of increased audacity in the mysterious combination by which we are surrounded; but it wanted not that sad proof to satisfy us of the existence of such a combination, or its deadly hostility to all that is respectable in the land.

“As guardians of the public peace, and in common with the magistrates of Ireland, we have laboured to avert the calamitous condition to which society is reduced; and we presume humbly to assure your Majesty, that this deplorable change is in no degree attributable to any relaxation, upon our part, in the discharge of our important duties. If our authority has no longer the efficacy it evinced in other times for the maintenance of public order, we trust that it will be remembered that a power greater than we possess has been suffered to develope itself in an organized agitation that pervades the country. With the true objects of that agitation we are not permitted to be acquainted, since it conflicts upon all occasions with the exercise of the authority deputed to us by your Majesty: but, whatever its objects, we feel that we should abandon our duty if, assembled on this lamentable occasion, we hesitated to express to your Majesty our deliberate conviction that the toleration of such a confederacy has been disastrous to the prosperity and safety of Ireland.

“We humbly beg leave dutifully to place at your Majesty’s service all such means as are within our power for the assertion of the law and the vindication of your Majesty’s authority. We can never forget that our right to your Majesty’s protection is the unconditional and honest discharge of the duties exacted by our allegiance. Actuated by the faithful spirit of this principle, it will be our happiness at all times to co-operate with your Majesty’s Government; having no other object in this humble expression of our sentiments than the protection of the faithful subjects of your Majesty, and the preservation of the peace committed to our care.”

It is quite impossible for us to enter at large upon the subject of our Foreign relations. It is, perhaps, enough to state, that while our home policy has been characterised by frivolity and egregious impotency, our foreign has exposed us to the scorn and unmitigated contempt of all Europe.

In the language of the “*Glance at State Affairs*,” the whole of which is worthy the most attentive perusal—

“In the management of our Foreign Affairs we find no consolation for the disasters, which have befallen us in the other departments of the State. Attached to almost every Administration since 1809, Lord Palmerston has dabbled in the nation’s affairs, without gaining any experience that has been useful. Perceval, Liverpool, Canning, and Goderich successively found him their Secretary at War; and at the age of fifty-four he is still discovered in Downing-street, the same empty, supercilious coxcomb as at five-and-twenty! Until “the Reform Ministry” came into power, his talent and fitness for office were duly appreciated, and he was placed in a situation that neither commanded

the means of being extensively mischievous, nor exposed his many absurdities to the uninterrupted view of the world. The Duke of Wellington, in the exercise of a sound discretion, turned him out of his place for being accessory to a petty intrigue; and chagrin and mortification accordingly relieved the Tory party of Lord Palmerston's friendship, and made him a convert to Whiggery. It is an aphorism, that "the greatest curse of folly is, that it can't hide itself;" and its soundness is very exactly proved in his Lordship's person. If his infirmities had merely brought *him* into contempt, the world would have extended its usual mercy and silent pity to insignificance. But Lord Palmerston's follies have had a wider influence, and compassion for individual misfortune is lost amidst the general indignation which is felt towards one who has uniformly betrayed the best interests of his country. Like that fabled unfortunate of old, at whose fatal touch precious metals were changed into dross, his Lordship has injured every thing with which he has been connected. Under his diplomatic care all our Foreign relations have been more or less shaken. Old allies have instinctively put themselves on their guard against mischief; tried friends have become cautious and suspicious; and jealous enemies, who were accustomed to be civil and submissive, now put on the most offensive impertinence, and almost bid us open defiance. The production, lately, of a mass of papers by the Foreign Office, exposes the hostility of Russia towards this country, and Lord Palmerston's previous knowledge of, and connivance at, the designs of the Russian Cabinet. His Lordship's conduct in the affairs of Circassia, Greece, Frankfort, the German Custom's league, Cracow, Algeria, the treaties of Unkiar 'Skelessi, Java, &c., prove his concurrence in the violation by Russia, Prussia, France, Austria, Holland, and the United States, of every international obligation by which these powers are respectively bound to Great Britain.

"The Autocrat has intimidated Turkey, taken possession of the Dardanelles, and openly insulted the British flag; France has subjugated Algiers and Constantine, and added them to its own territory. The Netherlands have been cut in two; Spain, formerly the scene of British glory, has been selected as the scaffold for British disgrace and punishment; and through the supineness and incapacity of the Foreign Secretary, we are at this moment menaced with a war with America, for our inattention to the claims of that country in respect of the disputed boundary of Maine and Canada. The American Senate has rung with aspersions against our honour and fair dealing as a nation; we are sneered at in the French Chamber; The Russian Autocrat sits peaceably in his closet and smiles at our remonstrances; all our old allies despise and hate us for our seeming treachery and hollowness; and through the dishonesty and meanness of a minister, we are reduced to the melancholy position of a people, who are constrained to feel not only that they are insulted, but that their real character is grossly misrepresented abroad."

All that has issued from the smithy of these political Cyclopes, has been in the shape of fetters for their country, or munitions of war for the hands of our enemies. They appear to occupy

themselves in alternately hatching new patronage schemes or devising crotchets for the pacification of Lord Brougham and similar awkward "*friends*," and hedging in the Queen with a palisade of wooden-headed Whig parasites.

Regardless of their high charge, their time is spent in finesse and dissipation, in consecrating enormities by the borrowed dignity of their offices, in dying the state with inextinguishable stains, and four times in the year grasping the money of the public.

A few of their underlings are kept sedulously employed hammering out apologies for their blunders and their crimes,

"In subtle Sophistry's laborious forge ;"

and, heaven knows, their work is arduous enough ! They revel in the foul filthiness of state plunder ; one and all determined to batten for as long a time as possible on the garbage of place ; with the unclean avidity of the vulture they luxuriate in corruption, point their satellites to the carrion,

"And hand in hand lead on the rank debauch."

In the interim the vessel of the State is foundering : far as the eye can reach, disaster, wretchedness, and ruin crowd the scene ; the sky lowers, the thunder mutters, the white foam hisses and curls its cresting flakes over the decks, the crew are paralyzed, the watch-lights are extinguished, the darkness of the storm shadows her,

"And thy dark pencil, Midnight ! darker still
In melancholy dipp'd, embrowns the whole."

The spirit of the age, raised by their incantations, and fondled into strength by their folly and their feebleness, stalks the land, and

"A thousand phantoms and a thousand spells
A thousand opiates scatters to delude,
To fascinate, inebriate, lay asleep,
And the fool'd mind delightfully confound"

Ichabod is engraved on every institution of the land ; and while foreigners gaze with wonder and admiration on our precipitate transition from greatness to decay, and with still greater wonder on the miserable folly that could lead us to permit such a race of pigmies to prostrate the energies and the glory of the country, they involuntarily give utterance to their estimate of England's present position and reiterate the cry—

"Sunk are thy bowers in shapeless ruin all."

Deep read in the art of keeping place ; many of them adepts in the study of sensual science ; skilled in nothing of service to their country, these wretched men are a stain, a reproach, a

dark impenetrable cloud blackening the records of our national existence.

“The man that blushes is not quite a brute;”

but these men delight in their infamy; like the noble productions in the fable, they shout with an ecstasy of self-admiration as they float down the broad stream of time,

“Lo! how we apples swim!”

Their tergiversation is as wonderful as their imbecility; in the words of Young, the Conservative party may now ask these pirouetting gentlemen, with reference to the notorious Appropriation clause, which was the lever by means of which the Conservative Cabinet was overthrown, and the Whig clique vaulted into place—

“Why thunder’d this peculiar clause against us?”

The spoils of office and the perquisites of place are the penates of this worthless crew;

———“*Semperque recentes
Convectare juvat prædas, et vivere rapto.*”

They promised much to their country when they took office; and they have certainly fulfilled that promise to the letter. They have done much; but it has been mischief and not good. Deputations wait upon them, and swelling words of promise are as plentiful as blackberries; the time comes to redeem their pledge, or fulfil their promise, and each of them thinks it no crime to fling his promise to the winds, and accordingly

“*Projicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba.*”

We are entitled to ask the question: how long is this to last? Where is the feeling of the country, its religious sense, its manly and consistent dignity? Is there life in the nation? or has the deadly virus of Infidelity benumbed alike its extremities and its heart? It is no mere question of party. It is far more. Everything that is great and illustrious, all that is pure and heavenly, every dictate of religion and morality, of patriotism and of loyalty, calls for the removal of Ministers. Their criminality is the result of a thorough absence of principle, and not the chance product of any fixed political opinions. They possess the property of the chameleon, and display to public gaze the profligate exhibition of a Cabinet changing hue with every pressure from without; assuming the complexion of every enemy of the state in rotation, and tinging their policy with an alternation of the leaven of Popery or of Infidelity, as their supporters may require or their Irish task-master demand.

What should we think of the man who, intrusted with the

care of a noble craft, walking the waters like a thing of life, should desert her in the storm, and leave her to the raging blast? who, when perils gathered round her pathless track, and the pealing thunder, the quick flash, the wild commotion of wind and wave, the raging fury of the hurricane, and the impetuous roar of the tempest strike terror into the heart of the bravest and every timber in the noble vessel groans as she toils through the foaming waters, should abandon her to the fury of the elements, and give her helm to the demon of the storm?

A far heavier weight of responsibility, and consequently a far weightier amount of criminality, rests upon the shoulders of the man who, intrusted with the guardianship of the first empire in the world, at a time when peril blacks the sky, and the deep foundations of the country rock to the centre with the accumulated violence of the tempest, can consent to leave the kingdom to its fate, and madly throw the reins of government to the man who has convulsed the empire and agitated the political elements into strife.

Yet this is precisely our position; and the thought is tenfold embittered by the memory of former Cabinets. The Administration which, "noble in defeat," made way for these shadows of statesmen, was in every respect worthy the nation. What might not England have expected with a Cabinet headed by the living model of Britain's chivalry and the unrivalled Peel?* But we do not despair. The illustrious statesman who

* Unrivalled, as Sir Robert Peel certainly is, in talent; unmatched in eloquence, and without a rival in political experience, tact, and judgment; with a mind of vast capacities, stored with knowledge, and elevated by genius, and endowed with all the virtues that command our admiration and our love; we do not, and we never can, forget his fatal abandonment of principle, and betrayal of his country, in the year 1829. It was a severe lesson to his country not to repose confidence in "any son of man." We deeply deplore the fall of so eminent a statesman. It admits of no extenuation, and we offer none. His star was at its zenith, and in the full blaze of its meridian splendour sank in the turgid gloom of blind expediency. He has suffered severely for it. While he has seen men who were consistent to the last in their opposition to the claims of the Papists go down to their graves in peace and tranquillity, with the honours and the gratitude of their country, undisturbed and uncursed by the bigotry of the Papist; he has himself been the constant mark of the very men he admitted into the citadel of the constitution; their coarsest insults have been heaped upon him; and every opportunity to annoy, perplex, calumniate, and disgrace him, has been seized upon with eager avidity. He cannot fail to have perceived the hand of retributive justice dealing out its righteous judgment in the events of the last ten years. We trust that our confident anticipations

has guided the noble vessel safely through shoals and breakers, has been obliged to relinquish his post by a base intrigue, and the rudder has passed into a feebler grasp. Dangers thicken, and calamity and disaster crowd every section of the hemisphere.* Ruin stares us in the face. Shall we sink? The thought were madness! What then? The alternative is at hand. Let the only men who can save the vessel from striking on the rock, or driving on the quicksand, be summoned to the helm. Let the voice of England be heard above the roar of elemental strife and the wild commotion of the storm, calling upon her former Ministry to re-occupy their posts, and save the rapidly sinking State. And they will return. Yes, and at no distant day. The necessity for their return is paramount, and its certainty is obvious. And they will re-enter upon their high and arduous functions with far greater applause, and with a more cordial shout of approbation from the British people, than had they never quitted office. Their names will live, the eulogies of history will be lavished upon them, and their memories be enshrined in the hearts of the myriads of posterity. Unborn generations will learn to lisp the record of their greatness, and their fame will be wafted down the tide of time, brilliant with the undying lustre of a nation's gratitude. But what is more than this, and what they will esteem as of far greater value, they will, in the sublime achievement of saving their country, their religion, and their Queen, have secured the grateful and the lasting admiration of the CHRISTIAN WORLD.

"Cuncti adsint, meritæque expectent præmia palmæ !

General Literature.

Beginnings of a New School of Metaphysics. By B. H. SMART.
London : Richardson. 1839.

THIS is a speculative work, capable of greatly interesting those who are devoted to metaphysical inquiries; but one of which, we suspect, the examination would scarcely be acceptable to many of our readers. It certainly displays a very considerable degree of ingenuity.

may be realized, and that his re-accession to office may be characterised by a manly avowal of his past sin. The stability of his Administration will depend upon it. Protestantism will prove his protecting ægis: political expediency will produce his speedy downfall.

A Key to the Hebrew Scriptures, &c. By the Rev. JAMES PROSSER, A. M., Perpetual Curate of Loudwater, Bucks. London: Duncan. 1838.

MR. PROSSER has constructed his work on the plan of the *Clavis Homerica*; consequently, a dictionary of the Hebrew will remain as necessary as ever for many purposes. The author has proceeded on the wild notions of Parkhurst, and considered the Hebrew not only as the most ancient, but as "evidently the parent of all other languages," than which no one theoretical notion is cherished which may be more easily overthrown. The proofs, which are offered of its philosophical accuracy belong also to the Hutchinsonian school.

We fearlessly affirm, that the short grammar, which is prefixed to the Vocabulary, will not enable any one properly to understand the Hebrew language; many indispensable rules are wanting, and others are not sufficiently developed. Although the writer has a rooted objection to the vowel points, the nature of many nouns and the reason of many inflexions cannot well be explained without their aid; and the deficiencies of his own grammar are strong proofs of their utility. We do not hold them to be infallible authorities in the interpretation of the Scriptures; but we maintain that they elucidate the grammar of the language. In the syntax, the adjective is shown to generally agree with its substantive in gender and number, and the verb to generally agree with its noun in gender, number, and person; but no instances are given where the adjective and verb disagree with them; but such, with the supposed causes of disagreement, are required in a grammar. No instance is given of the adjective standing before the substantive, and no cause for this construction is assigned;—none of feminine nouns being joined to verbs in the masculine, and no notice is even taken of the plural of excellence. The *conversivum futuri* is not mentioned: yet in the praxis we have examples of it, which the grammar is not in a condition to explain.

The vocabulary itself is too short to allow the pupil to judge for himself of the truths of the interpretations given: examples from other passages should have been added; and even if the space was too limited for full extracts, references to such by figures should have been made. Some of the derivations are in our opinion wrong, as that of ELOHIM; and it is evident that errors of this description must occur, where the Hebrew is considered to be in a state to explain itself without the help of other tongues. We confess that we can perceive but little utility in Mr. Prosser's work.

Diatessaron ; or, the History of our Lord Jesus Christ. Compiled from the four Gospels according to the authorized Versions. Oxford : Parker. 1837.

Lectures explanatory of the Diatessaron ; or, the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Collected from the four Gospels in the form of a Continuous Narrative. By JOHN DAVID MACBRIDE, D. C. L., Principal of Magdalene Hall. Oxford : Parker. 1838.

THIS Diatessaron is formed on the model of that published by the late Dr. White ; and the Lectures, which are written to explain it, although compendious, convey much original information, and condense or notice the more useful parts of other labours in harmonizing the Gospels. The history of the books, of the text, and of the versions is given in epitome ; and if a full index had been added to the volume, its utility would have been greatly increased. There are many critical remarks of a peculiar felicity, much practical matter of deep importance, with discussions branching out of particular subjects, which deserve a high place in literary estimation. For instance, from the institution of the Lord's Supper, occasion is taken to enter into the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is first historically treated, and then most convincingly disproved. In the Gospels the events which each Evangelist relates, not to be found in the others, are set forth, and the apparent discrepancies in the different accounts of the same events are reconciled by a very clear and satisfactory process. The history of the crucifixion is detailed with singular ability, and the impelling causes are exhibited in a masterly way ; but the most valuable portion of this branch of the general subject is the luminous demonstration of the very minute fulfilment of prophecy, and the explanation of many of our Saviour's motives. Thus, when Christ exclaimed *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*, his object doubtless was to draw the attention of all to the Psalm, which these words commenced, because in it his sufferings and the circumstances attendant on them were most graphically portrayed. The appearances also after the Resurrection are determined with great care : and proof is offered for every assertion, probability for every conjecture. The Lectures are in all respects superior to Macknight's work ; and they will be found more generally useful than Greswell's, because the profound investigations of the latter seem to confine it to the learned. It is a *summum opus*, calculated to add to the evidences of Christianity, and to ground the Christian in his faith.

Historical Sketch of the rise, progress, and decline of the Reformation in Poland, and of the influence which the Scriptural doctrines have exercised on that country in literary, moral, and political respects. By Count VALERIAN KRASINSKI. London: Murray. 1838.

SUCH a work as the present has long been wanted to provide us with valuable additions to the history of Protestantism; and the inquiry seems to have been conducted with great perseverance and examination of documents. The Polish language is so little known in this part of Europe, that a native was required to elucidate many obscure facts. From the introduction of the Christian religion to the reformation of Luther, antiquity has been carefully explored, and parts of the national history, which were affected by or affected the introduction of Christianity into Poland, are brought forwards in completion of the author's task. It is shown, that before the reformation of Luther anti-Romanist works were published in that country, and that in Polish Prussia the Lutheran doctrines circulated very soon after the proclamation of them at Wittenberg. In the first years of the reign of Sigismund Augustus a fresh impulse was given to Protestantism: Valenty, a parish priest of Krzczonow, openly avowed it, and gave the first instance of marrying a wife: Pizz-claustci, a nobleman, publicly embraced it, and Nicolaus Olz-snicki converted the first Roman Catholic to it. Persecutions followed these things, and Nicolaus, parish priest of Kurow, suffered martyrdom. Hostile feelings against the Roman Catholics were soon manifested, and quarrels ensued down to the Council of Trent.

The life and labours of John Laskior Alasco are among the most interesting parts of the narrative: and the injury which the cause of the Reformation received from the introduction of Anti-Trinitarian opinions into Poland is strongly described. The struggles between Protestantism and Romanism, the rise and progress of the Anti-Trinitarian sect, and the efforts made by the Protestants to effect an union of their churches, accomplished at last in 1570 by the consent of the Synod of Sandomir, together with an account of the introduction of the Jesuits, are the principal remaining things in the volume. We much desire the appearance of the second volume, which will complete the history.

Count Krasinski has shown great judgment in his narrative:—we wish it to have the success which it deserves.

The History of the Church of Christ, from the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, to the 18th Century. In 3 vols., in continuation of *Milner's History of the Church of Christ.* By the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, M. A. Vol 1. London: Cadell. 1838.

SINCE the continental writers are continually issuing histories of the Christian Church, accommodating them as much as possible to their individual doctrinal views, some of which have found their way into this country, by means of translators, it was highly expedient that the works of our own ecclesiastical historians should be extended to the present time. The reformation of Luther would especially form an introductory point to doctrinal discussions, and give a tinge, according to the writer's opinions, to the subsequent parts. He who will compare Milner's History with that of Count Stolberg will see these observations verified. Then again comes that of Neander; in another way exemplifying our words.

Hence, it is not surprising that we should congratulate the Protestant Church on Mr. Stebbing's selection of this task, as we know no one better qualified to discharge it, whether conscientiousness or ability be the question. He has in no way disappointed our expectations: with the aid of great learning he has in a flowing style faithfully recorded the events, as truth appeared from his analysis of conflicting statements; whilst he has boldly shown Milner's excellencies, he has honestly disclosed his faults, and his definition of Melancthon's character is most just. The difficulties of the Protestant reformation are propounded *seriatim*, and the conduct of the Emperor is with impartiality, and without undue acrimony, set forth. The notices of the other Reformers, and their friends, as well as their enemies, are judiciously incorporated into the work, and enhance its interest.

Our readers should peruse it with care; and we are convinced that they will experience from its perusal the same delight which it imparted to us, and that they will join with us in admitting that Mr. Stebbing has most creditably performed his undertaking, as far as it has appeared, and erected an imperishable monument to his fame.

Parallel Universal History; being an Outline of the History and Biography of the World; divided into periods. London: Whittaker. 1838.

MR. PHILIP PRINCE, of Elms, Mitcham, as we may see in the dedication, is the author of the work. The various historical tables, in which reigns and events are chronologically

arranged, such as those of Major Bell, rendered the composition of this volume a very easy task; but its facility detracts not from its utility. The summary of the leading things, and the biographical notices, are very excellent. It is adapted to become a companion to the History of England, and should, for that purpose, be in every one's possession.

The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, an Inquiry, in which the received title of the Greek Epistle is vindicated against the cavils and objections, ancient and modern, from Origen to Sir J. D. Michaelis, chiefly upon grounds of internal evidence, hitherto unnoticed, comprising a Comparative Analysis of the style and structure of this Epistle, and of the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul, tending to throw light upon their interpretation. By the Rev. CHARLES FORSTER, B. D., Rector of Stisted, Essex, and one of the six preachers in the Cathedral of Christ, Canterbury. Duncan: London. 1838.

THIS magnificent undertaking has occupied the chief part of Mr. Forster's time for five years, his thoughts for more than five and twenty. Than the Epistle to the Hebrews there is no part of the Greek Testament which has been more assailed: the Socinians reject it, because its author positively establishes Christ's Divinity; and on the strength of the old controversy, denying it to have been written by St. Paul, treat it, if not as apocryphal, yet as uncanonical.

One of the strongest proofs advanced in support of St. Paul's authorship, is the long list of words, which either only, or in peculiar senses occur in this and his other acknowledged Epistles, by which it is shewn incontrovertibly that the same person was the writer of all. As in the others, there is in it an uniform return, at certain intervals, to the same ideas, in the same, or equivalent words: this is exemplified in c. III, 1, 2, 5, 6, 14—IV, 14, 15, 16—X, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24—XII, 14, in connection with *ὁμολογία*—in which our particular attention is demanded to the use and recurrence of certain terms. These four passages exhibit a designed parallelism: the key-word is *ὁμολογία*, and they contain ten other terms, "equally peculiar to this epistle and St. Paul's undisputed writings." To the same purpose Cor. xv. 26, 28, and Heb. ii. 8, 14, are compared; for each uses *καταργεῖν*, a very unusual word, in the same sense; many parts of the 15th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians are likewise collated with different parts of the first and second chapters of that to the Hebrews, and all produce the same result.

Very many words, peculiarly Pauline, are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that to the Romans; occasionally in that to the Galatians, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, that to Titus, the two to Timothy, those to the Philippians and Ephesians, the Second to the Thessalonians, more rarely in the First, that to the Colossians, and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, after which a list is given of those which occur neither in the New Testament, nor in the Septuagint, nor in the Apocrypha; but are only to be found in this, and in the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul.

The comparison of portions of the Apostle's speeches recorded in the Acts with portions of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the tabular harmony of words, sentiments, and doctrines which is frequently given, between this and other Epistles, completely set the question of authorship at rest. It is a body of evidence which no preceding writer has collected: it is the produce of a most laborious investigation. The demonstration is set forth in various ways: one of the most conclusive being its conformity to Paul's habit of "turning aside from the subject, upon the occurrence of some particular word, forsaking the train of thought then in hand, and entering upon a parenthetical sentence, in which that word is the prevailing term." The antithetical style is also Pauline; of which we give an instance according to Bengel's table, from Heb. xii. 18.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>Mons</i> qui tangebatur : | 1. Sion <i>Mons</i> : |
| 2. Incensus ignis : | 2. Urbs Dei viventis : |
| 3. Caligo : | 3. Myriades angelorum et primogenitorum : |
| 4. Tenebræ : | 4. Judex Deus omnium ; |
| 5. Procella : | 5. Spiritus justorum consummatorum : |
| 6. Tubæ sonus : | 6. Testamenti Novi Mediator Jesus : |
| 7. <i>Vox</i> verborum. | 7. Sanguis aspersionis perbene loquens. |

The paronomasia or play upon words is, moreover, proved to agree here with the other Pauline writings: the quotations, and modes of quotation from the old Testament are distinguished by the same characteristics as those in the others: whilst the use of key-texts, which Mr. Forster has the credit of bringing to light, establishes it as the work of St. Paul. In explanation of these we will quote the author's words: "The phenomenon to which I would now invite attention, is the regular and orderly

recurrence, at certain intervals, generally towards the beginning, the middle, and the end of each Epistle, of the same words and ideas, serving at once as indices both to the main subject and to the subordinate topics, and as land-marks of their return ; or, as I have thought it not unappropriate to denominate them, as *key-texts*." The subject and the key-texts afford a reciprocal authentication, and strongly mark the genius of the Pauline compositions. Having illustrated this fact in a cursory view of the other Epistles, Mr. Forster proceeds to show that this Pauline canon, if we may so term it, is signally discernible in that to the Hebrews. He then gives very extensive tables of the principal key-texts which occur in this and the other Pauline writings.

The external evidences are next considered : after which arguments are offered in proof that by the Epistle of St. Paul referred to in 2 Peter, iii, 15, 16, that to the Hebrews was intended. It is shown, that St. Peter borrowed many sentiments and expressions from St. Paul's Epistles in general ; and it is argued, that as he was under equal or greater obligations to this, it is plain that he included it in *his* canon of St. Paul's Epistles, and that in his admonition *to the Hebrew converts* this is the Epistle to which he referred. After having examined a series of expressions, which justify his remark, the author produces more extended coincidences, such as—

Hebrews.	1 Peter.
xi. 13. (cf. Eph. ii. 19.)	i. 1. ii. 11.
xii. 14, 24. x. 19, 22.	i. 2.
x. 36. i. 1. (ix. 14.)	i. 9, 18-20
v. 12-14.	ii. 2. iv. 11. v. 9.
vi. 5.	ii. 3.
vi. 2.	iii. 21.
xii. 15.	v. 2.
vi. 4-6. (cf. x. 26-29.)	2 Pet. ii. 20, 21.
vi. 11. (xii. 2. ii. 18. iv. 15,	2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.
16.) v. 11, 12. x. 38.	
i. 1.	2 Pet. iii. 2.
ii. 2, 3.	2 Pet. i. 19.
xiii. 20, 21.	1 Pet. v. 10. v. 2-4.
ii. 7, 9.	2 Pet. i. 17, 18.

These and the other coincidences which are introduced, are so very striking as to leave no doubt on the impartial mind, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was peculiarly the subject of St. Peter's allusion. The valedictory addresses also are identical in

sentiment, and nearly so in expression :—in the last passage on the preceding list, St. Peter, alluding to St. Paul's quotation and arguments, has explained the meaning, by showing the completion of the prophecy to have taken place at the Transfiguration. The whole is conducted with such perspicuity, and furnished with such overwhelming conviction, that we cannot consider it any longer as a debatable question.

Great as have been the advances, which many of late years have made in Biblical literature, this labour of Mr. Förster, whether we regard its arduousness, the patient skill with which it has been conducted, or the most satisfactory issue, to which it has been brought, is decidedly unrivalled. The subject is most fully handled—indeed fairly exhausted; and those only who have devoted their lives to studies of this toiling nature can appreciate properly the unremitting assiduity of the author. The originality of the proof should of itself entitle it to a most wide circulation and to a translation into other tongues: and we trust that the writer will not be neglected, as many have been, by those, who have the power of advancing merit to a higher sphere of utility.

A new Method of Learning to Read, Write, and Spell a Language in six months. Adapted to the German. By H. G. OLLENDORFF. London: Whittaker. 1838.

WE cannot call Mr. Ollendorff's a new plan; we have seen some Latin grammars accompanied like this with exercises. Of the verbs there is a great diffuseness, but not a proper list of those which are irregular; of the notices there is too much where little would suffice, and too little where much is required. The syntax is mixed with the several parts of the work, of which we do not approve. It is nevertheless a labour of merit, and one which happily will impart the idiom.

The Protestant Memorial. Strictures on a Letter addressed by Mr. Pugin to the supporter of the Martyrs at Oxford. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

A VILER or more lying publication than that, which Mr. Welby Pugin, with unblushing effrontery and most Papistical malevolence, has issued against the memories of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and against Protestants in general, with the exception of the authors of the Tracts (if, indeed, they be Protestants), since the equally lying book of Sanders made its

appearance, has not disgraced the press. Without producing proper authorities, he has daringly made the most startling assertions, and even vomited out aspersions, which are self-refuted; folly and hatred, intolerance and ignorance are united in his attack on the Protestant cause. To the informed man his work is a matter of contempt; but to the uneducated it is calculated to cause much mischief.

Hence Mr. Lathbury has employed himself in examining his allegations, and has shown in every instance their dark iniquity and abject stupidity: not one thing has Mr. Pugin advanced as a fact, which Mr. Lathbury has not overthrown, and, overthrowing the whole, he has proved the weakness of the writer, and the foulness of his object. We trust that this complete reply will be circulated in every town, village, and hamlet; for though there may be many, which Mr. Pugin's fiction may not have reached, Mr. Lathbury's memorial will be sure to show the lies, of which Papists are capable.

Dionysius Longinus on the Sublime; chiefly from the text of Weiske. By D. B. HICKIE, L. L. D., Head Master of Archbishop Sandy's Grammar-school, Hawleshead. London: Longman. 1838.

THE very light nature of the preface did not encourage our expectations that the work itself might be of graver execution. But it has been most ably done, and the Greek index is very copious.

An Introduction to the Translation of English Poetry into Latin Elegiacs and Hexameters. By FREDERICK E. GRATTON, B. D., Master of Stamford Grammar-school, late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Whittaker. 1838.

THE first part relates to the change of idiom in the two languages; the second to the Latin translations. This is not a book which we can copiously discuss; it is sufficient to say that the verses are excellent and the Latinity chaste.

Madmoments or first Verseattempts by a Bornnatural, addressed to the lightheaded of society at large. By HENRY ELLISON, of Christ Church, Oxford. London: Painter. 1839.

THE compounds in these volume are very singular; the work has two authors—a Born-natural and Henry Ellison, whom we

can only identify by making Henry Ellison the Born-natural. The verses are very uncouth; and if they were intended to be imitations of Young's *Night Thoughts*, they have marvellously failed. We hope Henry Ellison, or the Born-natural, will tarry at Jericho till his beard is grown. We like not precocious boys.

Instructions for the Relief of the Sick Poor in some Diseases of frequent occurrence; addressed to a Parochial Clergyman, residing at a distance from professional aid. By the late RICHARD PEARSON, M. D. of the Royal College of Physicians, London, and formerly Physician to the General Hospital, Birmingham; Author of "*A Practical Synopsis of the Materia Alimentaria, and Materia Medica.*" "*Thesaurus Medicaminum.*" 18mo. Third Edition. By his Son, the Rev. RICHARD PEARSON, M.A. of St. John's College, Oxford. 12mo. London: J. G. and F. Rivington. 1838.

THE motive for this publication is thus stated by the author in his preface:—

"A clergyman of the Established Church, the author's particular friend, residing in a part of the country where medical assistance cannot always be promptly and punctually obtained for the poorer inhabitants when suffering from sickness, having expressed a wish to be provided with some instructions, by which he might be able to afford relief on such occasions; the contents of the following pages (some subsequent additions excepted) were communicated to him in writing, for his own private accommodation. On perusing them, his friend thought, that they might, if printed, be useful to many parochial clergymen similarly circumstanced with himself. They have, therefore, been committed to the press."

As far as we are able to judge, they appear to be very well calculated to answer the object proposed by the author. They are expressed in clear and simple language, with very little admixture of technical terms, and although printed in a very good type, are contained in a very small compass. We are scarcely qualified to pronounce on works of a medical character, but judging from the reputation enjoyed by Dr. Pearson, we have no doubt that the one before us will be found to contain very useful information.

The reverend editor of the present edition of this unpretending but valuable little work, has enriched it with some important additions in the form of an appendix, amongst which will be found directions to be followed in cases of drowning and other kinds of apparent death, tables of medical weights and measures, &c.

The Psalms of David, arranged to Chants, which are carefully selected to suit the general expression of each Psalm, for the use of Private Families : and dedicated to the Rev. R. J. B. Henshaw, M. A. By JAMES KING, author of a "Treatise on Singing," &c. folio. London : Published by the Author at his residence, 39, Foley-place, Cavendish-square.

2. *A Collection of Glees, Madrigals, Rounds, Quartets, Elegies, &c. partly original, but chiefly selected from the Works of Eminent Composers, with an arranged Accompaniment for the Piano Forte, and dedicated to the members of the Ladies Madrigal Society.* By JAMES KING. London : Published by James King, and sold at his residence, 39, Foley-place, Cavendish-square.

IN the first volume before us (and we understand it is the author's intention to continue the work, until he has gone through the whole of the Psalms) Mr. King has adapted chants to the first fifty Psalms. When we say that the greater part of these are selected from the works of Tallis, Farrant, Orlando Gibbons, Purcell, Handel, Croft, Boyce, Cooke, &c., it is hardly necessary, perhaps, to say anything more in commendation of them. But in addition to this, Mr. King appears to have displayed considerable judgment and no small degree of good taste in the principles by which he has been guided in making his selection. To use his own words, in the following extract, which we make from the very able introduction prefixed to this work :—

"I have made the Psalm the great consideration : the chant, although carefully selected to suit the expression, being only a means through which the expression is conveyed. To prevent any of the verses being chattered in an unbecoming manner, I have placed the notes over the syllables to which they belong, so that the melody and the language may flow together, and preserve that devotional feeling which should always accompany the performance of sacred music. In applying the words to the notes I have endeavoured to unite the accents of the language with the accents of the music, by which alone the proper reading of the Psalm is preserved. This has not been attended to in any publication that I have seen : the usual instructions are to sing the three last syllables to the three last notes ; but should the verse end with a word of three or more syllables, it is evident that a sad confusion of sound and sense must be the consequence. Simple as may appear the chanting of a Psalm, I have never heard it fully accomplished in private, until I made this arrangement ; for unless the chant be learned by heart (the words not being hitherto printed with the music) the circumstance of having to look at the music in one place and the words in another, without any plan by which the voices can be kept together, is very detrimental to the effect. In the present arrange-

ment the whole Psalm is in view. It is true that to accomplish this end I have swelled out the work far beyond any collection of chants, hitherto published; but then it is complete, which is not the case with any collections that I have met with; you may play them, but cannot sing them. However lightly some may estimate the chant, I trust I shall find many who will agree with me in giving it a prominent place amongst our sacred music—for this reason: that it is not for display, but for devotion; and if our children are pleased by the music, and led to a frequent performance of it, may we not hope for a good result by impressing on their memory the Psalms of David?"

Mr. King, we believe, has long been most extensively known as an eminent professor of music, more particularly in that branch of it which relates to the culture of the voice, and is equally celebrated for his general musical science and taste, and for his intimate and profound acquaintance with the works of the elder and purer school of musical composition. In conclusion, we strongly recommend this work to all who are admirers—and what persons of taste are not?—of sacred music.

The second work which stands at the head of this notice is just published by Mr. King, and contains a collection of glees, madrigals, rounds, &c., some of them composed by himself, but the greater number consisting of compositions of acknowledged value, which are rarely to be met with, except in very choice libraries; together with several favourite glees by modern composers, which have never before been published.

"The whole," in the words of the editor, "being carefully selected with regard to the words, excluding every thing of a bacchanalian character; amongst the most ancient are a few light madrigals of the sixteenth century, and some rounds from *Pammelia* and *Deuteromelia*, published A.D. 1609. A selection has been made from Jackson's elegies and quartets, now becoming scarce. The arrangement of the glees is made as familiar as possible; the alto and tenor parts are in the treble clef, and the whole is compressed into two lines for the piano-forte."

In this work, which we think cannot fail to be very interesting to all lovers of this species of musical composition, the editor has given another proof of his great musical learning and fine taste.

Proverbial Philosophy; a Book of Thoughts and Arguments, originally treated. By MARTIN FARQUHAR TUPPER, Esq., M. A. Second edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. London: J. Rickerby. 1838.

We ought to have noticed this work long since. However, the neglect has not arisen from inattention to its merit. In

the present prosaic and matter-of-fact age, a new volume of poems, although of very moderate pretensions, is sure to meet with a welcome reception from all imaginative persons. But the present work is of a far different character. It is original in its design, original in its execution, and many of the sentiments and ideas which it contains are equally new and original, and, what is far better, it possesses within itself evidence of a pious and religious frame of mind. It would be very difficult to give the reader a good idea of the peculiar style in which this work is written, we shall, therefore, extract one of the "Thoughts."

OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

"Shame upon thee, savage monarch, man, proud monopolist of reason ;

"Shame upon creation's lord, the fierce ensanguined despot :

"What, man ! are there not enough, hunger, and diseases, and fatigue,—

"And yet must thy goad or thy thong add another sorrow to existence ?

"What ! art thou not content thy sin hath dragged down sufferings and death

"On the poor dumb servants of thy comfort, and yet must thou rack them with thy spite ?

"The prodigal heir of creation hath gambled away his all,—

"Shall he add torment to the bondage that is galling his forfeit serfs ?

"The leader in nature's psalm himself hath marred her psalter,—

"Shall he multiply the din of discord by overstraining all the strings ?

"The rebel hath fortified his stronghold, shutting in his vassals with him,—

"Shall he aggravate the woes of the besieged by oppression from within ?"

* * * *

"The dog, thy humble friend, thy trusting, honest friend :

"The ass, thine uncomplaining slave, drudging from morn to even :

"The lamb and the timorous hare, and the labouring ox at plough :

"The speckled trout, basking in the shallow, and the partridge gleaning in the stubble :

"And the stag at bay, and the worm in thy path, and the wild bird pining in captivity :

"And all things that minister alike to thy life, and thy comfort, and thy pride,

"Testify with one sad voice that man is a cruel master.

"Verily, they all are thine ; freely mayst thou serve thee of them all.

"They are thine by gift for thy needs, to be used in all gratitude and kindness :

"Gratitude to their God, and thine—their Father, and thy Father:

"Kindness to them who toil for thee, and help thee with their all:

"For meat, but not by wantonness of slaying; for burden, but with limits of humanity:

"In luxury, but not through torture; for draught, but according to the strength:

"For a dog cannot plead his own right, nor render a reason for exemption;

"Nor give a soft answer unto wrath, to turn aside the undeserved lash:

"The galled ox cannot complain, nor supplicate a moment's respite:

"The spent horse hideth his distress, till he panteth out his spirit at the goal;

"Also in the winter of life, when worn by constant toil,

"If ingratitude forget his services, he cannot bring them to remembrance;

"Behold he is faint with hunger; the big tear standeth in his eye;

"His skin is sore with stripes, and he tottereth beneath his burden;

"His limbs are stiff with age, his sinews have lost their vigour;

"And pain is stamped upon his face, while he wrestleth unequally with toil;

"Yet, once more, mutely and meekly endureth he the crushing blow;

"That struggle hath cracked his heart-strings—the generous brute is dead!

"Liveth there no advocate for him? no judge to avenge his wrongs?

"No voice that shall be heard in his defence? no sentence to be passed on his oppressor?

"Yea, the sad eye of the tortured pleadeth pathetically for him;

"Yea, all the justice in heaven is roused in indignation at his woes;

"Yea, all the pity upon earth shall call down a curse upon the cruel;

"Yea, the burning malice of the wicked is their own exceeding punishment.

"The angel of mercy stoppeth not to comfort, but passeth by on the other side,

"And hath no tear to shed when a cruel man is damned." p. 245.

We envy not the person who can read these thrilling lines without having every warm emotion of his heart stirred within him. We might, perhaps, have selected passages from this volume, which would have better illustrated the peculiar character of the author's genius, but we were guided in our choice by the excellence of the subject, which is one that cannot be too often or too deeply impressed on every human mind. Highly do we honour the amiable and accomplished author, for having exerted some portion of his eminent talents in the cause of those suffering beings, whose cry, although it may, alas! plead in vain with man, shall not be unheard by the Creator.

This volume deserves a more extended notice than our limits will permit us to give it; for almost every page is replete with good feeling, sound sense, and mature wisdom. Considered as a poet, the author has cut out a path for himself. The only living writer between whose mind and his own there may be said to exist any resemblance is, perhaps, Wordsworth.

Bellingham; or, Narrative of a Christian in search of the Church. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALIN, B. A., Rector of Stifford, Essex; Author of "Village Lectures on the Litany." 12mo. London: J. W. Parker. 1839.

WE admire the design of this unpretending little volume exceedingly. To write a narrative of individual life mingled with discussions on the most important subjects with which humanity is concerned, is a task difficult indeed to accomplish, but which, when well executed, affords both gratification and instruction. In the present work both these are combined. There is sufficient of narrative to engage the attention of the miscellaneous reader, without derogating from the sacred character of the subject, which would have been compromised by too much admixture of secular matters. The language is always good, and occasionally eloquent; and the arguments are expressed with great clearness and force, and there is a tone of manly and independent sentiment running through the whole work which merits great commendation. We sincerely hope, that Mr. Palin will pursue the path of writing in which he has commenced with so much promise. We cannot help thinking that in his hands it will yield very excellent fruits.

Ecclesiastical Commission. A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, with Considerations on the Letter of the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Charges of the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Gloucester and Bristol. By a Dignitary of the Church. 8vo. London: Rivingtons. 1839.

WE are not aware who is the author of this pamphlet. Whoever he may be, he certainly possesses the power of analysis in no small degree. The author proposes to review, or rather to compare one with another, the following publications on the subject of the Ecclesiastical Commission: namely, the Lord Bishop of Lincoln's charge to his clergy in 1837, and his Lordship's Letter to the Archbishop, dated 1838; the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol's charge, 1838; the Lord Bishop of London's charge, last published, 1838; and he proves, by pas-

sages selected from these several publications, that their authors, all of the Commission, differ very considerably in their sentiments upon this important subject, although all professing to advocate its existence. We ourselves had always thought that the Bishops of Lincoln and Gloucester were by no means thoroughly convinced of the absolute justice and propriety of the Commission, of which they were members. The first of these last named prelates, it appeared to us, was originally induced to belong to it through fear of the ultimate effects of those assaults which were made some years since by a certain party in the country upon the Church; and the latter, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, if we are to judge from his charge, is evidently a member of it against his better reason. It is always with feelings of sorrow that we venture to use the language of remonstrance towards any members of the right reverend bench; and of the three eminent individuals whose publications are referred to in the pamphlet before us there can be but one opinion. We entertain a high respect for their talents, learning, and piety; but still, in justice to ourselves, we cannot refrain from stating that we are decidedly opposed to them on the subject of Ecclesiastical Reform. We object to the principle on which they would act, to the manner in which they would put that principle into execution, and we consider that the means which they propose to adopt are utterly inadequate towards the acquisition of the end contemplated. We consider that there exists with no body of individuals in this country the *right* to divert any portion of Church property from its original uses, and if such a *right* did exist, we should still consider that the objects upon which it is proposed to exercise such a power were selected with the greatest want of judgment and discretion. We consider, moreover, that the contemplated end, namely, the extension of parochial ministrations, excellent as it is in itself, and earnestly as we should wish to promote it by legitimate means, is still one of such magnitude, that to talk of supplying it by the utmost amount which can be collected by the niggardly paring from those honourable and well-spent endowments which are attached to our cathedrals, is utterly absurd. Evil will be the day, both for the moral welfare and for the national character of our country, when those beautiful and magnificent structures, which in every district of the land raise their time-honoured spires towards heaven, shall be robbed of any portion of their decent splendour by the schemes of a cold, and heartless, and desecrating reform.

Pictures of the World, at Home and Abroad. By the Author of "*Tremaine*," "*De Vere*," "*Human Life*," &c. 8vo. 3 vols. London: H. Colburn. 1839.

THIS work is not to be considered as a mere work of fiction; for it has a much higher object in view than is generally proposed in productions of that class. It is true that each volume contains a tale, and one, moreover, of singular interest; but it is evidently used as a vehicle for conveying opinions and sentiments on some of the most important subjects which can interest the human mind, which almost always bear the impress of sound sense, and are occasionally full of profound wisdom. The first volume contains the adventures of a man who, born in a respectable station of life, and with good prospects before him, yet forfeits the favour of his father, throws up situations of distinction and affluence, deserts his relatives and friends, all through a weak and foolish ambition, displaying, as some of its most striking effects, a morbid sensitiveness to imaginary slights and affronts, and an absurd fear of incurring the reproach of vulgarity, which very often brings on its possessor the very evils he was endeavouring to avoid. This is a most instructive tale for the young aspirant after distinction, and, if we mistake not, will save many a heart-burning and many a disappointment to the would-be-ambitious.

The second tale is of a graver character, and is full of romantic incident. Its hero is a country gentleman of ancient family and large landed possessions, whose comforts, happiness, and very safety even are engendered by that moral curse—we can call it by no other name—which, under the name of reform, so cruelly disturbed the tranquillity of this once favored land, but a few years since. The workings of this spirit, not only in public but in private life, are admirably described; indeed every line is effective. The author makes one of his characters say,

"I have seen proud men truckle to upstarts; *professed* despisers of patronage filling the country with new placemen; denouncers of sedition hugging rebels; and the jesuit principle of voting a falsehood, that good may come of it, openly avowed and openly defended. I have seen convicted rogues give themselves the airs of persecuted integrity, and held up by brother rogues as martyrs to virtue; I have seen the grossest blackguardism reduced to a regular system in political warfare. In short, the reign of brutality and vulgar abuse has been established, in lieu of the decencies of life; assassination of the living, and insult to the dead, are fearlessly recommended; and the whole character of the country, among the highest as well as the lowest, is changed. Hence subscriptions for monuments to pseudo-patriots by the first nobles of the land. * * * But the best joke of all is to hear the most violent declaimers against the aristocracy themselves the most exclusive and frivolous of aristocrats: for of all nonsensical

fine people, of all paid and pretending exclusives, in our silly society, you Whigs, who have ever equality and the people in your mouths, reject them most in your hearts, and are yourselves the most exclusive, most usurping, most fine, and most repulsive." Vol. 2, p. 7.

The tale which is contained in the third volume is employed in developing the horrible effects produced by the detestable principles inculcated by the disciples of the French revolutionary school. This is done by tracing the progress of two young men, fellow students in a German university, who are both deeply imbued with these execrable principles, but one in a more moderate degree than the other. We wish some of our English Liberals would study this volume: closed as their ears generally are against conviction, we think they could scarcely fail, at least those amongst them who are not yet steeled by the hardening influence of modern liberalism, to derive profit and advantage.

The public are deeply indebted to the amiable author for the good service which he has rendered the Conservative cause, in this as well as in the other admirable works, which have been produced by his brilliant talents.

We shall conclude with a parting word of advice to the author, which, highly as we respect him, will, we hope, be taken, as it is meant, in good part. There are some expressions contained in the introductory chapter on Enthusiasm, prefixed to the tale which fills the third volume, which we could wish him to look over attentively, and which, when he has done so, we are sure, if the opinion we have formed of him be correct, he will perceive to be capable of misrepresentation, and will lose no time in correcting, before the appearance of a second edition.

Francia's Reign of Terror. Sequel to Letters on Paraguay. By J. P. and W. P. ROBERTSON. 8vo. London: J. Murray. 1839.

PARAGUAY has been hitherto considered as a country closed up against the observation of all but its own inhabitants; but the Messrs. Robertson have succeeded in withdrawing the veil, and we must say that they have presented the public with a very curious and striking narrative of events, the details of which are given in a very graphic manner. The work is a very lively picture of the consequences, which result from revolution and the overthrow of legitimate authority. First of all, the formation of a pretended republic; in other words, the transfer of power into the hands of a number of tyrants, which ends in one individual becoming possessed of supreme and uncontrolled dominion over the lives, fortunes, actions, nay, almost the very

thoughts of the unhappy objects of his despotism. Such a picture of wickedness, cruelty, and atrocity has scarcely been unfolded, except in the annals of the French Revolution.

A General Outline of the Animal Kingdom. By THOMAS RYMER JONES, F. Z. S. Professor of Comparative Anatomy, King's College, London. 8vo. Parts 1, 2, 3. London: John Van Voorst.

THIS work appears to us to fill up a vacuum which has long existed in the literature of Natural History; we mean a general view of that branch of science, in a cheap and compendious form. Such splendid works as Shaw's Zoology, and Mr. Griffith's enlarged edition of Cuvier's Animal Kingdom are, by their price, placed beyond the reach of many persons, and in addition, from their extent and size, do not present so useful a medium of reference as works on a smaller scale. We cannot help thinking, therefore, that Mr. Jones's work will be a great acquisition to persons interested in the delightful study of Natural History. The engravings on wood with which it is embellished are very finely executed, and the whole work, indeed, as to its external appearance, reflects great credit on the publisher.

Eve Effingham; or, Home. By J. FENIMORE COOPER, Esq., author of "The Spy," "Homeward Bound," &c. 3 vols. 8vo. London: R. Bentley. 1838.

WE are induced to notice the tale before us from the very singular picture which it presents of society of every class in the United States of America, a picture which, independently of its singularity, is capable of furnishing much instruction. We only wish that those persons who are enamoured of a republic, and who are so fond of looking at America as the model of human perfection, would read these volumes with but common attention; prejudiced as they are, if they are not wilfully determined to close their eyes against conviction, we cannot help thinking that their absurd admiration would be considerably cooled. As an illustration of the *firm and beautiful system of law* established in that happy country, we may remark that Mr. Cooper makes one of the characters in his tale remark, in answer to the complaint made by his friend of a wanton trespass committed on his property by the rabble of the village in which he lived, and which he expressed his intention of prosecuting, "that such a proceeding would be almost useless, as in America, should a verdict be

given by a jury in any case, it would be impossible to enforce it, if opposed to the will of the populace." If this is true, and the author is an American, how enviable must be the condition of the inhabitants of this *Land of Liberty*!

The Navy. Letter to his Grace the Duke of Wellington, K. G., upon the Actual Crisis of the Country in respect to the State of the Navy. By a FLAG OFFICER. 8vo. London: J. Nisbet and Co.; Hatchard and Son. 1838.

WE sincerely hope that some of the statements in this pamphlet are exaggerated: if they are true, the country is certainly in a very critical state. We heartily wish that the object which the author desires may be accomplished, and that Englishmen will begin to think a little more of the foreign relations of the country. Indeed, it is high time that the public attention should be directed to the strengthening of the external defences of the country, "and to regain and preserve that proud position which England has hitherto held among the nations of the world," instead of being turned to the weakening of her internal condition, and to the sapping of the foundations of her most venerable institutions, objects to which, we grieve to say, the popular mind has been guided for some years past with persevering industry.

Greece: Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D. D., late Fellow of Trinity College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge; Head Master of Harrow School. Royal 8vo. Part I. London: W. S. Orr. 1839.

IF the succeeding numbers of this work are at all equal to the first, which is now before us (and we see no reason to doubt it), we do not hesitate to say that they will form one of the most tasteful and beautiful publications which has ever issued from the press of this or any other country. The first number contains three highly-finished engravings on steel, covering the whole page, and thirty-two illustrations on wood, covering a portion of the page in which they appear. These are all designed and executed with great taste and skill; some of the latter, indeed, are quite equal in finish and effect to the finest engravings on metal. The manner in which the embellishments are disposed merits great commendation. They are arranged very much in the style of those which appear in the ancient illuminated manuscripts, many of the first letters being illustrated with an en-

graving, with which the letter is combined in the most ingenious manner, and some of the embellishments being placed round the margin of the page.

To say anything in praise of the letter-press is perfectly needless, when it is known to be by Dr. Wordsworth.

Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada. By Mrs. JAMESON, authoress of "Characteristics of Women," "Female Sovereigns," &c. 8vo. 3 vols. London: Saunders and Ottley. 1838.

ANY work connected with Canada can scarcely fail to claim attention at the present moment. The one before us undoubtedly contains a good deal of information relative to that country, although it is somewhat excursive in its plan. The account which the authoress gives of the Indian settlements, of the manners, habits, customs, and present condition of that unfortunate race, is very detailed, and will excite much interest, although of a painful nature. The descriptions of the magnificent scenery of the Western world, of its sea-like lakes and measureless forests, are drawn with great force and vividness of colouring, and are exceedingly pleasing. We wish we could say the same of the description of the moral features of some portions of the Canadian population; for, if her observations are correct, the vice of drunkenness (among the men at least, for the women form an honourable exception in every case) seems to be unhappily very prevalent among the settlers in the less inhabited parts of the country. As a set off against this, Mrs. Jameson has given some very pleasing pictures of infant settlements in the wilderness; from her account of one of which, called Erindale, at the mouth of the Credit River, we shall make some extracts. The reader will perceive that it is a striking comment on the very admirable state of the law in that most peaceful and particularly quiet country called Ireland:—

"Mr. M. was a Protestant clergyman of good family, and had held a considerable living in Ireland; but such was the disturbed state of the county in which he resided, that he was not only unable to collect his tithes, but for several years neither his own life nor that of any of his family was safe. They never went out unarmed, and never went to rest at night without having barricaded their house like a fortress. The health of his wife began to fail under this anxiety; and at length, after a severe struggle with old feelings and old habits, he came to the determination to convert his Irish property into ready money and emigrate to Canada, with four fine sons from seven to seventeen years old, and one little daughter. Soon after his arrival he

purchased eight hundred acres of land along the border of the Credit. With the assistance of his sons and a few labourers he soon cleared a space of ground for a house, in a situation of great natural beauty, but then a perfect wilderness; and with no other aid designed and built it in very pretty taste. Being thus secure of lodging and shelter, they proceeded in their toilsome work—toilsome, most laborious, he allowed it to be, but not unrewarded; and they have now one hundred and fifty acres of land cleared and in cultivation; a noble barn, entirely constructed by his sons, measuring sixty feet long by forty in width; a carpenter's shop, a turning lathe, in the use of which the old gentleman and one of his sons are very ingenious and effective; a forge, extensive outhouses, a farmyard well stocked, and house comfortably furnished, much of the ornamental furniture being contrived, carved, and turned by the father and his sons. These young men, who had received in Ireland the rudiments of a classical education, had all a mechanical genius, and here, with all their energies awakened, and all their physical and mental powers in full occupation, they are a striking example of what may be done by activity and perseverance: they are their own architects, masons, smiths, carpenters, farmers, gardeners; they are, moreover, bold and keen hunters, quick in resource, intelligent, cheerful, united by strong affection, and doating on their gentle sister, who has grown up among these four tall, manly brothers, like a beautiful azalea, under the towering and sheltering pines. Then I should add, that one of the young men knows something of surgery, can bleed or set a broken limb in case of necessity; while another knows as much of law as enables him to draw up an agreement, and settle the quarrels and arrange the little difficulties of their poorer neighbours, without having recourse to the 'attorney.' The whole family appear to have a lively feeling for natural beauty, and a taste for natural history; they know the habits and the haunts of the wild animals which people their forest domain; they have made collections of minerals and insects, and have 'traced each herb and flower that sips the silvery dew.' There is an atmosphere of benevolence and cheerfulness breathing round, which penetrates to my very heart."

Mr. M., it appears, was the magistrate and also the parochial clergyman, and some facts which he related to Mrs. Jameson with reference to his living, we recommend strongly to the attention of our readers, as they confirm the account which Mr. Bettridge has given of the state of the Church in Canada, a branch of our venerable Church which ought to be so peculiarly an object of interest from many circumstances. He (Mr. M.) said that on two sides the district under his charge might be considered as without bounds, for, in fact, there was no parish boundary line between him and the North Pole. He has frequently ridden from sixteen to thirty miles to officiate at a marriage or a funeral, or baptize a child, or preach a sermon, wherever a small congregation could be collected together; but latterly

his increasing age rendered such exertion difficult. His parish church is in Springfield. When he first took the living to which he was appointed on his arrival in the country, the salary, for here there are no tithes, was two hundred a year; some late measure, fathered by Mr. Hume, had reduced it to one hundred. He spoke of this without bitterness as regarded himself, observing that he was old, and had other means of subsistence; but he considered it as a great injustice both to himself and his successors—

“For,” said he, “it is clear that no man could take charge of this extensive district without keeping a good horse, and a boy to rub him down. Now, in this country, where wages are high, he could not keep a horse and a servant, and wear a whole coat, for less than one hundred a year. No man, therefore, who had not other resources, could live upon this sum; and no man who *had* other resources, and had received a fitting education, would be likely to come here. I say nothing of the toil, the fatigue, the deep responsibility—these belong to his vocation, in which, though a man must labour, he need not surely starve; yet starve he must, unless he takes a farm, or a store, in addition to his clerical duties. A clergyman, in such circumstances, would hardly command the respect of his parishioners.” vol. 1, p. 305.

This is another instance of that beautiful and one-sided spirit of economy which prevails in our country. Our readers are not all, perhaps, aware, that an annual sum of 15,000*l.* was given by the Government to the Society for Propagating the Gospel, which was employed by that society in supporting clergymen of the Church of England in our North American colonies. That sum is now entirely withdrawn, and the clergy in Upper Canada are, with few exceptions, we believe, almost entirely supported by this society out of its own funds. It is true, by the Constitutional Act of the Canadas, passed in 1791, a certain portion of land, under the name of Clergy Reserves, was set apart in each parish, for the express and sole use of the clergy of the Church of England, to be settled as incumbents in that country; but in the greater number of cases these lands, to which the clergy have a just and undoubted right, are still withheld from them, and they are dependent upon voluntary aid for their subsistence. The Popish priests in Lower Canada are all in possession of respectable incomes, no one of them having less than 200*l.* per annum, and the greatest part having 300*l.* per annum. The Government, also, of this Protestant country allows an income of 1,000*l.* per annum, to a Popish bishop in Lower Canada, and 500*l.* per annum to a Popish bishop in Upper Canada.*

* Whilst we are writing this, we perceive by the papers of the day

Before dismissing Mrs. Jameson's work, we cannot refrain from saying that there are many observations and opinions contained in it to which we most decidedly object, and which, indeed, have nothing at all to do with the matter of the book.

The Huguenot, a Tale of the French Protestants. By the Author of "The Gypsy," "The Robber," &c. 8vo. 3 vols. London.

MR. JAMES is well known as a most able writer of works of imagination. The ground which he has chosen for himself is one to which we are surprised that so few writers of fiction have resorted, considering how replete it is with striking and romantic incidents. We allude to the history of France, from which Mr. James has drawn the events and scenes of most of his tales. The one before us is quite as interesting as any of its predecessors, and could scarcely have appeared at a more seasonable moment. The majority of Protestants, at the present day, would seem to have forgotten, when they contemplate the progress of Popery, that it is the very same religion which, at no inconsiderable a distance of time, enacted those dreadful scenes of horror which are recorded to have taken place in France during the persecution of the Protestants in the reign of Louis XIV. Some of these detestable cruelties Mr. James has described in the tale which is before us, and shocking as they must be to the feelings of the reader, they will not be without their use if they serve to put him on his guard against the implacable foes of the Church of his native land. Whatever its friends and advocates may say, the Popish religion, although it may be concealed under specious disguises, still retains the same cruel and persecuting spirit which has always characterized it, and waits only for a favourable opportunity to display it again.

America and the American Church. By the Rev. HENRY CASWALL, M.A., Rector of Christ Church, Madison, Indiana; and late Professor of the Theological Seminary of the Diocese of Kentucky; ten years resident in the United States. London: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1839.

THIS work supplies what has long been a desideratum in British literature—a candid view of the history, discipline, present

that the Government have sent out a Popish bishop and two Popish priests, with an allowance in money to each, to the Cape of Good Hope; the Romanists in that colony, let it not be forgotten, being only in the proportion of one in twenty compared with the Protestant population. This is economy and impartiality indeed!

state, and future prospects, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Mr. Caswall is the author of the well-written "Epitome of the History" of that Church which enabled us to present to our readers much important and valuable information, in the first volume of our journal. That "Epitome" is, of course, incorporated in the present work, but with considerable additions and corrections. Having resided ten years in different parts of the American Union, in the various capacities of missionary, professor of theological literature, and rector of a parish, Mr. Caswall has enjoyed opportunities for collecting accurate information relative to the state of education, religion, and the Church, far superior to those possessed by some *rapid* travellers; who, after a short residence of a few months, or even weeks, have communicated to the public the crude results of their hasty and imperfect observation. Combining the details of his personal adventures (if we may be allowed the expression) with historical research, Mr. Caswall has produced a very interesting and well-written volume, from which we should gladly have transferred some passages to our pages, had we not already devoted a considerable space to the history and present state of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. At a period when the opponents of the United Church of England and Ireland are openly endeavouring to undermine her influence, and to injure her reputation, a work like the present is peculiarly seasonable. Most cordially do we concur in the hope expressed by Mr. Caswall, that the contemplation of a remote branch of the English Establishment, rising from its ruins, and not merely sustaining itself, but increasing with unprecedented rapidity, *will induce Englishmen to prize more highly those blessings which they now enjoy*, and which so many in America are endeavouring to extend.

This work is handsomely printed, and is illustrated with a map containing the Diocesan divisions of the United States, together with four engravings representing a log Sunday-school and church, the ruins of the first church built in America, and a camp-meeting by night. We hope it will receive, what it richly deserves, an *attentive* perusal, and a widely extended circulation. We shall probably recur to Mr. Caswall's volume in a future number.

Increase of Popery. By JAMES RUDGE, D. D. Painter:
London.

WE have received a very able pamphlet upon Popery, by the Rev. Dr. Rudge, which we wish especially to recommend to our

readers. It contains much valuable information. The style is forcible, and the work bears indisputable marks of the author's talent and attachment to that Church of which he has, upon more than one occasion, proved himself so able a champion.

Ecclesiastical Report.

WHAT will, or what will not the present Government do to depress the Church and advance Popery? What intrusion into private rights shall appear too great, if intrusion into Church property be sanctioned? By what tenure more secure than that under which the subject of an Asiatic despot holds his head shall the people of England hope to hold their possessions, if those of the Church of the God of their forefathers be not respected? To these reflections we are led by the gross violation of justice which has already been tolerated, where the ecclesiastical body is concerned, and by the rapine-threatening hand which is stretched forth against our cathedrals, collegiate-churches, and benefices; for we argue, whether the grasped funds be applied to the Church or not, that the principle cannot be recognised, that what belongs to one party can be appropriated to another without the losing party's consent, and we affirm that this plan of robbing Peter to pay Paul, according to the vulgar adage, scarcely differs in the degree of dishonesty from those acts which have immortalized Turpin and the predatory fraternity; yet, indeed, with this difference, that the latter, though proceeding equally on an assumption of *power*, assumed it at a personal risk. We should scarcely have greater reason to dread a government which would confiscate Church property at once, than one which stealthily proceeds towards it. It is another question whether there would be a government which would so far dare to try the public spirit. It is one thing to endeavour secretly to undermine the foundation, another openly to assault a castle.

But whilst Lord John Russell, affecting an anxiety that Church property should be taken from its legal owners to promote clerical efficiency, rhodomontades and throws out highly sounding words of vanity in Parliament, he discovers not the same anxiety to authorise the commission to inquire whether among the Duke of Bedford's broad lands there be not Church property which might be rightfully reclaimed. No! lest such a deplorable measure should be suggested, especial care is taken to protect lay-patronage, and divest the contemplated act of any application to lay-patrons. And though through this omission the

real, the genuine object of the commission must become apparent, no war is waged against lay-impropriations; and the robbery of Church property is contemplated, whilst want of Church means, in certain quarters, is the subject of complaint; to remedy which want, restitution is not made from these lay impropriations, nor from Church lands in the possession of the laity, but private bequests, ancient charters, grants, and the like, are sought to be diverted from their consecrated purposes, and the public faith is dishonoured by the proposal of what, in *foro conscientiae*, and according to every form of jurisprudence, is public fraud.

Nor is this wrongful appropriation of the funds the only grievance suggested: but vested patronage is violently disturbed and transferred either to the Crown or the Bishops; custom, which has a certain validity in law, is set aside; clerical offices are curtailed; no proper provision is left for the fit maintenance of cathedral services, or even the repairs of the buildings; and an illegal, imperious Commission is promoted to preside over the house of God; and, as if self-respect was lost in the general object, to the two chief bishops on the Commission extraordinary privileges have been proposed to be granted. The entire principle has been that of pauperization; for whilst the cathedral dignitaries have been in prospect despoiled, the application of the income to be taken from them will not materially enrich those on whom it is desired to be conferred. Such a distribution of the loaves and fishes will satisfy no party: *but whether the distributors may, or may not, find some fragments to be picked up*, we will not tax our prophetic spirit to determine. Far would we be from conjecturing whether any, or how much, or how little, of the examples of Ananias and Sapphira might be observed in this partition of property; we, however, know that where the carcase is, the vultures will flock.

It is, notwithstanding, singular that whilst the efficiency of the Church is *pretended* to be consulted by this *impoverishing* process, the Schismatics and Papists, who labour with every energy of body and soul to destroy *its efficiency*, are not harassed by vexatious enactments, are not circumscribed in their incomes, are not confined in their character of enemies to the Establishment *within even salutary restrictions*, but are provided with every facility to advance their own power, and carry their dark projects into effect. Whether their creed be right, or whether it be wrong, whether the National Church should be defended, or whether the boiling scum of impetuous opinions should be permitted to defile the land, are no longer legislative considerations. The revolutionary blood-hounds are let loose against

Church and State by those who are sworn to guard both. Nor does the extraordinary coalition suggest matter of alarm and prospective watchfulness: though we have daily evidence that however widely the united religious enemies of the Church may vary among themselves, though there be in the incongruous union Socinians denying the Divinity of Christ, Jews exulting in his Crucifixion, Infidels and Atheists, Calvinists, Armenians, and men who know not what they are, the one design of opposition to us generates a common feeling, overwhelms sectarian difficulties, and binds in a confederacy a stranger mass of men than ever Hogarth's satiric pencil could have portrayed. What matters it to the political speculator, provided they will join in this one object, if they shall hereafter cut each other's throats, like the armed men that sprang from the *dragon's teeth*, in the legend of the *Golden Fleece*?—tools cannot be used for ever: what matters it, if they be broken up or put aside?

In this queer masquerade of Socinian, Jew, Papist, and Schismatic, all is really under the mask. None attempts to remove the disguise of the other, to see what *he really is*; it is sufficient that each contributes his utmost to the general object of anticipated amusement—the overthrow of the Church. The Legislature is either wilfully blind, or will not observe the suspicious fact, that Dissenters, who have dared to object Popery to the English ritual, hesitate not, for the sake of political ascendancy, to combine with the Papists themselves; that, whilst they rightly account Popery a system of idolatry, they scruple not to engulf their own religion in the vortex of worldly ambition, and become the actual confederates of the idolaters. The Papists, too, though it is their article of faith that heretical sovereigns may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, and that no faith should be kept with heretics, with whom an oath is as the chaff which the wind scattereth away, are encouraged, both openly and covertly; their enormities are either unnoticed or palliated; their institutions are supported and enriched; their places of worship are permitted every where to arise around us; and they are allowed to domineer in the Senate, as if their religion was that of the country. In exact proportion as the Church is curtailed of her rights, and injuriously treated in the exercise of her sacred vocation, is licentiousness, under the name of liberty of conscience, tolerated in her foes.

In a bill which is about to be brought before the consideration of Parliament, there is a Machiavelian clause authorising the arbitrary removal of the chaplains of prisons, who are clergy-

men, and the substitution of men of schismatical persuasions. Thus, as if the governing Powers were determined to plunge us headlong into blood and anarchy, the very cells of the prisoners are opened to the inroads of those who would poison the public mind and demolish the Ecclesiastical Establishment, even to the schemes of those who desire a general scramble : to whom, though, as to the fox, the grapes may yet be sour, by them, nevertheless, the time of possession is anticipated, when they will be found sweet.

It is not astonishing that in such days of rebuke and violence the ass should kick the sick lion of the Church, and bray in concert with the tongue of the Apocalyptical beast (Rev. xiii. 5, 6,) which spake great things and blasphemies ; nor that both should wage war with the saints of the Most High. But we know, from the word of God, that the period of this violence is predefined and limited,—that the Church shall arise from the oppressions by which she is chastised, pure as gold which has been tried in the fire ; and be hereafter presented blameless, not having spot, wrinkle, or any such thing, to her Father and her God.

We repeat a remark which we long ago made, that some of us have unfortunately contributed to this state of affairs by sinking the proper Ecclesiastical and Academical rank, and co-operating with Dissenters in certain societies : that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, this combination has proved in a most melancholy way. The regret that such awkward associations should have taken place is the greater, since the Church, having had already within its own fold societies with objects identically the same as those which the odd compounds *professed*, there was no necessity for Churchmen co-operating with Schismatics. Common sense should have certified them that such co-operations must be attended with losses on their part ; and fearful have those losses been. These beginnings of evil practice introduced other irregularities, which have injured the Church. Some time since we noticed the omission of parts of the Liturgy in some parishes in the west of England : the author of the *Voice from the Font*, whom we reviewed, made the same assertion ; but neither he nor ourselves appear to have been believed. Dr. Rudge, however, we are informed, on good authority, has so fully proved the existence of this uncanonical practice in the April number of *The Churchman*, that our assertion is removed from all doubt. If, then, Churchmen be first found associating with Dissenters, in a manner recognizing their pseudo-ordination, then as nearly as possible accommodating the Church service to the custom of Dissenters, it is not at all

strange that Dissenters should attempt an advance from the conceded parity to superiority; but it is most strange that the Bishops of the Church should not have prevented these things.

Had not this laxity respecting our Liturgy been induced by these means, we doubt whether the Oxford Tracts would have been sent forth to the world: when mischief has once been commenced, those never are wanting who will try to complete it. Thus we have in the Church one party which mutilates the Liturgy, and another which, under the plea of pointing out defects, would bring it to the model of the Breviary; one which complains that it is too long, and another which would lengthen it most wearily, and make its character Papistical. Both these are subjects of internal government; and the remedy of both is within the still existing powers of the Episcopal Bench: in the name of the Church, and of their ordination and consecration vows, the orthodox clergy should memorialize the respective Bishops to guard their dioceses against these first sprouts of Schism, to stop each innovation, the one that has taken place the other that is contemplated, and to exert that authority which has been confided to them *without respect of persons*. The Church should be *as a city which is at unity with itself*.

THE BALLOT.

THERE has been a great deal of declamation thrown away by the Radicals on the hustings, and not a little unprofitable disquisition ventured by the journalists, who take a like one sided view of events, in crying up the Ballot as the proper corollary of Reform. These are the same people who insisted upon "the whole bill and nothing but the bill." Sir Robert Peel prophesied truly that on the Tories would devolve the duty of defending the so called Magna Charta of Lord Grey; and accordingly we find that the loudest brawlers for Reform were the first to inveigh against their own measure. That its working has disappointed its authors we can very readily believe. It was intended to effect a party revolution, to make the freeholders of Great Britain one vast Whig constituency; but it has not operated so exclusively as was anticipated and desired. If we could convert the country into one wide religious community (an Utopian vision which seems not likely to be realized in our days), Universal Suffrage would be a most advisable and just expedient, and for the same cause every approach that the people make to goodness and intelligence renders more feasible and safe a greater extension of the franchise. But we must take the world as we

find it, and although we are persuaded that Englishmen (despite the dangerous "little knowledge" of a certain portion of the lower middle classes) may more safely be entrusted with political power than any other people in the universe, we are yet of opinion that a most unpardonable risk was run in admitting the ten-pound borough householders to the elective franchise. The country may go forward, but she cannot retrace her policy, and the national movement towards a republic needed no fresh impulse. We should have felt our way more cautiously, and not taken such an important step in the dark. If we have escaped that danger, we owe no thanks to the foresight of our legislators. There would appear to be something in the English character inimical to legislative evil, a sort of chemical property, whereby those nostrums which threatened the destruction of the constitution are converted into healthful chyle and nutriment. The country seems to be taken kindly to the poisons of her political purveyors, and all things augur that when she shall have recovered from the first shock of their deleterious specific (which had been fatal to any other people) she will go on her way rejoicing as if her constitution had not been tampered with—as if she had not been brought to Death's door by the audacious experiments of unhesitating empirics. If we have escaped, it is by the mercy of Heaven; and should we be outraged by the infliction of the Ballot, it is our belief that the same Almighty hand, through the agency of the secondary cause we have just stated, will lead us safely through the ordeal. But there is no need for the nation to tempt Providence for the gratification of the Radicals, and we shall interpose the full extent of our ability to prevent the calamity of the Ballot overtaking the people of these kingdoms. Those political innovators who, overlooking its injurious working in the United States, clamour for the Ballot being brought into operation in Great Britain, invariably proceed upon the assumption of a general corruption. The Vote by Ballot implies a state of slavery, and can only be construed as symbolical of concealment and suspicion. It is a mysterious, illiberal institution, and, whatever our Radicals, judging from themselves, may fancy, alien to English habits, it can never produce the fruits that should be engendered in the lap of liberty. It includes a direct and explicit patronage of cowardice and double dealing. It is a libel upon our countrymen to say that they are of so feeble and irresolute a character that they require protection from intimidation and bribery. Do we recognize these traits as characteristic of Englishmen? They are the exception, and the Ballot is nothing else than a contrivance to scatter the seeds of the evil, where it happens to exist, over a wider surface. If there be this want of

constancy and public spirit in Great Britain, which we are far indeed from believing, the cure is to be sought in the inspiration of firmness, not in encouraging timidity—not in teaching free men to draw a veil of concealment over the performance of their proudest duty. Men should offer their votes in the face of day, and so would all virtuous citizens, even were elections taken according to the Radical device. Concealment could never after all be anything but permissive. Most wise and honourable men would notify to the public for whom they voted, because the great value of the franchise in the eyes of our countrymen is the opportunity it affords of *declaring* their sentiments, of testifying to the truth. The example thus set would be followed by persons of inferior standing, and their neighbours and acquaintance would almost always be able to tell by the general character of the parties whether they spoke truth or not. If they preserved silence, their silence would be commonly more significant than speech. For all purposes of good the Ballot would be a dead letter; but it would teach a bitter lesson while it said to the man on the eve of sacrificing to freedom at the hustings, which is her altar—"You are about to exercise your discretion wisely and patriotically, but make a mystery of your opinion, adopt the conduct which would suggest itself to you if you had perpetrated an atrocious crime." When Englishmen exchange their election saturnalia; their riots and their mobs—their squibs and their libels—the uncompromising language of opposing candidates *face to face* upon the hustings,—for such a dark, inquisitorial, morally degrading system as the Ballot, they ought at the same time to cease to arbitrate their quarrels with the fist, and take to the mask and the stiletto. It is a species of gagging act, and can never, any more than that of 1795, thank God, be naturalized in Great Britain. Let it thrive where it may, we will have nothing to do with such a loathsome political weed, the fruitful parent of simulation, ambiguities, equivocation, and falsities without number. But even granting the monstrous hypothesis of the Radicals to any extent—viz: cowardice and venality in electors—the exercise of wanton authority and the abuse of their legitimate moral influence in candidates,—we totally disbelieve that the flattering conclusion these scribes and spouters have come to would be found to have even the slightest foundation. We are firmly persuaded, on the contrary, that in the last election, for instance, ninety-nine of the county freeholders in every hundred voted as they did vote out of the deference and respect they owed to their legitimate patrons, who, they felt truly, were better capable than themselves of understanding the merits of the great political questions which divide

the country. They knew that they were incapacitated through defective education, and that their means of arriving at a correct judgment were comparatively limited. Above all, they felt that in the soil were identified the interests of all who lived by the soil—whether those who received the surplus, or those who wrought on that ever-standing miracle of a kind Providence; and that they were knit to the cause of their respective landlords by one of the strongest of all ties—that of affection and respect, based on their mutual hopes and common policy, *Τέτατοι γὰρ σύνομιαν ἐλπίδες κοινάι.* *

Therefore they looked up to the large landed proprietors for their cue with such simple faith as children might to their parents, and whatever the superficial Radical may fancy, it is good for the country, in every point of view, that it should be so. The only effect of the Ballot on such constituencies would be to make them feel uncomfortable, dissatisfied with themselves, and to induce un-English modes of thinking and acting in other particulars.

But as respects the town constituencies, the case is very different, and (to make no mention of intimidations, the abuse of her Majesty's influence and name) we entertain a very shrewd suspicion, that at least a sixth of the electors, who voted on the last occasion for the Radical candidates in the metropolitan boroughs, acted against the secret conviction of what was their duty.

They were biassed by those cabals and associations, and those links which are as strong as adamant; the terrorism inseparable from a corporate Hydra, whose every head is a mob—the dread of incurring the opprobrium of their pot-house or other companions—the horror of singularity—the stigma attached to an apparent apostasy; every one of these considerations made them averse to act on their disbelief of the ephemeral reports and falsities, and operated against the Conservatives at the last election. Here, undoubtedly, the Ballot would have been, in some sort, a protection; and, as respects bribery, it would have soon come to this, that none but wealthy capitalists or the representatives of wealthy companies would ever venture to offer themselves as candidates. By voting in daylight general corruption is rendered impossible; but if the facilities of the ballot produced £2,000,000 sterling prostitution money at one general election in America, what would be the amount in the United Kingdom, where the accumulated capital is, at least, five times as great?

Now the Conservatives are the richer party, ten to one; and when men are bought over in masses and clubs, as in the United States (and the Ballot being introduced, neither the pecuniary outlay, nor the number of the bribed, will be limited by the dread of discovery and the influence of public opinion), it will follow that the Conservatives, as the highest bidders, will possess themselves of what would then be a most expensive, but, nevertheless, a marketable commodity—Legislative power. Here our argument rests upon the hypothesis of a general corruption, the existence of which we emphatically deny. But in the other respects, as allowing the constituencies all over the kingdom the exercise of their private judgment in the country, it would make little difference any way, whilst in large towns Conservatives would obtain a decided advantage. It is our firm persuasion, for example, that with the Ballot the Marquis of Chandos would not lose a vote; whilst, under the same screen, not a Radical Member would be returned for a single metropolitan borough. In short, we are sure, that, regarded as a mere question of human politics, the *immediate* effect of the introduction of the Ballot into these kingdoms would be highly beneficial and conservative, *especially in Ireland*; but we hold such a system of voting to be in itself a gigantic moral evil, and that, therefore, it can only, in the result, prove injurious to that nation which is timid, mean spirited, and weak enough to adopt it.

ADDITIONAL PROOFS OF THE PAPISTICAL TENDENCY OF THE OXFORD TRACTS.

It will be seen, from the (Roman) *Catholic Magazine*, that the Oxford Tract Divines have received from the Papists a most affectionate congratulation upon their movement towards Popery. The following extract from that periodical will perhaps astonish many of the followers of this new body, which has lately sprung up within the pale of the Establishment :

“ Most sincerely and unaffectedly do we tender our congratulations to our brethren of Oxford that their eyes have been opened to the evils of private judgment, and the consequent necessity of curbing its multi-form extravagance. It has been given to them to see the dangers of the ever shifting sands of the desert in which they were lately dwelling, and to strike their tents and flee the perils of the wilderness. They have already advanced a great way on their return towards that Church within whose walls the wildest imagination is struck with awe and sobered down to a holy calm, in the enjoyment of which it gladly folds its wearied wings; before whose God-inhabited altars the proudest intellect prostrates itself in adoration of its CREATOR; under whose

immense expanse all its denizens are united in one faith ; no wrangling, no contention breaks with unhallowed sound the soul-entrancing harmony. They have already found in the mine, whose recesses they have been exploring, gems of great price, more valuable than silver, and gold, and precious stones—which shine as stars on the darkness of this life, but are accounted as mere glittering gewgaws by those who have not had the patience to make themselves aware of their worth. There are yet many more to be gathered and treasured up ; but the success has been such as to encourage a prosecution of the search, which may God continue and direct to a happy conclusion ! Again we congratulate them. They have found the clue which, if they have perseverance to follow it, will lead them safely through the labyrinth of error to the clear day of truth. We can, we do, forgive them that, urged by the clamour of their opponents, many of them exhibit towards us an extreme degree of intolerance, by way of proving their abhorrence of such of our tenets as they do not as yet hold, and exhibiting themselves as good and true men to the eyes of their brethren. All this we can readily excuse, because we know how natural is such misplaced zeal to our frail nature ; but yet, even in this temper against us, such is the force with which the modicum of truth they have received has operated, that their voices have been raised to swell the shout with which we hailed the late great triumph of truth and humanity over error and persecution. For that shout we thank them ; and for all wherein they have sinned against us we forgive them heartily, and wish them strength and grace to persevere in the path along which they are now journeying. They see the necessity of such an authority as their claim ; they cannot fail soon to see that it rests upon other shoulders ; and then the spirit we respect in them will surely rise superior to all worldly considerations, and lead them to worship in that temple built under the shade of a goodly tree, bringing forth sweet fruit, whose noble and widely-spread branches were once but buds on an insignificant sapling. Some of the brightest ornaments of their Church have advocated a re-union with the Church of all times and all lands ; and the accomplishment of the design, if we have read aright the ‘signs of the times,’ is fast ripening. Her maternal arms are ever open to receive back repentant children ; and, as when the prodigal son returned to his father’s house, the fatted calf was killed and a great feast of joy was made, even so will the whole of Christendom rejoice greatly when so bright a body of learned and pious men as the authors of the ‘Tracts for the Times’ shall have made the one step necessary to place them again within that sanctuary, where alone they can be safe from the moving sands beneath which they dread being overwhelmed. The consideration of this step will soon inevitably come on ; and it is with the utmost confidence that we predict the accession to our ranks of the entire mass.”

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

IN the Article upon “National Education,” in our last number, we cannot be justly accused of having made an unfair statement of the tendency of the Irish system ; for it is abundantly clear, from the evidence taken before the Committee of the House of

Lords, which was occupied some weeks in the investigation of the various reports in circulation, as to the nature of the instruction afforded in the schools under the control of the Commissioners. We had prepared several extracts from this evidence, with the view to presenting them to our readers, but the length to which our remarks have already run, compel us to defer their publication till another opportunity, when we hope to be able to enter fully into this momentous question. It is a question in which every Englishman is deeply interested. The plan, even now, is not confined to Ireland. It has been introduced into Liverpool under the patronage of the new council, and disgrace and failure have attended its adoption. Had it been otherwise, we should ere this have had a proposition from the more grovelling of our legislators which would seek to force the Irish scheme on us in England. True, the system was formed for the express purpose of conciliating Popery, and therefore was not wanted in districts where the modern spiritual tyranny is as yet unknown. True, the compromise of spiritual predilection was justified on the plea that Papists constituted the numerical majority, and therefore in England, where we have not hitherto reached such a pitch of degradation, the plea would be unsustainable. These are objections which would weigh with good and sensible men. But, alas! those now at the helm of State are neither the one nor the other. If the plan would have gained them popularity, their cry would have been, "Let truth perish, and principle be trodden under foot, if by making common cause with the reckless we can continue to receive the *pay* of office." But, God be praised! the system has been tried on English ground; and the soil which has been enriched with the blood of a long line of martyred saints is no fit spot for Popish weeds to be allowed to flourish and luxuriate. The experiment was tried in Liverpool, and most nobly did the inhabitants of that great town stand forth to vindicate the honour of God, which was assailed, when it was sought to hide the record of his infinite love from the gaze of the young child of eternal promise. In a former number we have noticed a spirited pamphlet, by Alexander Watson, Esq., which this exigency called forth; and we look with pious exultation on the success which has attended the truly Christian zeal of the clergy and laity of Liverpool, in an hour when, humanly speaking, the happiness of a coming generation was about to be immolated on the mercenary altar of a base and time-serving expediency. But while the arm was prepared to strike, the providence of God interposed, and the calamity was averted from our land. But there must be no false sense of security. The Irish system was based upon an unhallowed surrender of Catholic truth, in order to assimilate

the principles of the Church in Ireland with those of the Church of Rome; but the attempt has, through God's good providence, proved a failure. The very parties whom it was sought to win over are loudest in their denunciation of the scheme, and the attempt to unite principles as opposite as Christ and Belial—God's ark and Dagon, has been signally frustrated. But this may not always be the immediate consequence of an unholy truce. If we do not now raise our voices in behalf of our persecuted brethren in the sister country, we may have to call in vain for aid in the day of our own calamity. Let us be bold to demand that religious instruction, or none, be given to the subjects of Queen Victoria. Let us insist on this instruction being subject to the SUPERVISION OF THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY. Let our protest be unceasing and firm against any surrender of principle. If this country is to remain under the protecting shadow of the Omnipotent Wings, it can only be by her people obeying the injunctions of that inspired volume which has been vouchsafed unto us as our help in time of need—our stay in adversity—our solace in affliction—our star of hope when treading the valley of despair—our sun of joy and peace to illumine and cheer us in our intercourse with a world of conflicts and of trouble—our guide when perplexed—our confidence in doubt—our wisdom and our happiness at all times. Yes, but for the BIBLE and its sacred truths, but poor would be the consolations of philosophy to the heart bowed down with grief and torn with anguish. But for the word of the all-wise God, but dim and flickering would be the unstable light which the lamp of reason could throw out. Blessed book! in thy sacred pages alone can wisdom ineffable be found, and truth without any admixture of error is the peculiar characteristic of thy holy message! We here, then, repeat our demand that the Bible shall be the textbook of our people's instruction, and that the Clergy shall be their guides in this matter. With no other teaching and none other teachers will the people of England be content. Whatever education is given to the young of England, it must be given from the BIBLE, AND UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE CLERGY OF THE CHURCH.

GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL DIOCESAN CHURCH BUILDING
ASSOCIATION.

WE have continued to watch with unceasing interest the progress of this and similar valuable institutions, now happily spreading themselves through the length and breadth of the land, although we have not made any specific mention of their proceedings in some of our late numbers. It is not to be expected

but that the operations of such societies should be slow and gradual, and that the excitement awakened at their first foundation must be greater than during their future silent but not less certain advance. We are, however, rejoiced to observe that all of them are successfully pursuing the "even tenor of their way," and fulfilling the best and utmost wishes of their projectors. Two causes have accidentally combined for our selections—the "Gloucester and Bristol Association," as a fair specimen of the working of other like institutions—the one from having seen recorded the munificent contributions of the Rev. Dr. Warneford in aid of the funds of that particular society; and the other, the testimony of the Bishop of Salisbury, recently given in favour of its active efficient usefulness. His Lordship, at a recent meeting in his own diocese, quoted the above association as an example deserving of imitation, and stated that its funds greatly exceeded in amount those of the Salisbury Institution, all comparative circumstances being taken into due consideration. The liberality of the Rev. Dr. Warneford is almost without precedent in recent times. Independently of other donations, it appears he has placed in the hands of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol the sum of two thousand five hundred pounds, to be applied in equal portions for the purpose of endowing five churches, which are now either in progress of erection, or resolved to be built under the auspices of the society, besides 500*l.* more towards a parsonage-house at Cinderford; the worthy donor attaches one condition to the extension of his bounty, namely, that the nomination of ministers to the above churches shall be placed in the hands of the Bishop of the diocese. We consider this a very wise and salutary regulation, as calculated to ensure the appointment of fitting clergymen for these important stations. Nor is this the only instance of great liberality on the part of disinterested individuals. Charles Bathurst, Esq., of Sydney Park, the learned and highly respected chairman of the County Quarter Sessions, has contributed one sum of 950*l.* towards the endowment of the Church of Cinderford, in the Forest of Dean. At Bristol similar good intentions are beginning to manifest themselves, and we shall be happy to record their realization, as well as the other proceedings of the society, in a future number of *The Church of England Quarterly Review*.

END OF VOL. V.



